

RUSSOPHOBIA

[content](#)

§ 1. PURPOSE OF THE WORK

How is the spiritual life of our people flowing now? What views, moods, likes and dislikes - and in what layers - shape people's attitudes towards life? Judging by personal impressions, the scope of searches and (maybe throwing?) Is unusually wide: one hears about Marxists, monarchists, Russian native speakers, Ukrainian or Jewish nationalists, supporters of theocracy or free enterprise, etc. etc. And, of course, about many religious movements. But how do you know which of these views are more widespread than others, and which only reflect the opinion of an active loner? Sociological surveys on this topic, it seems, are not being carried out, and it is doubtful whether they would give an answer.

But then the unexpected happened: in the 70s there was an explosion of activity in this particular area. In the stream of articles passed here from hand to hand or published in Western journals, the authors revealed their worldview, views on various aspects of life. Fate seemed to open the lid of the saucepan in which our future is being cooked, and gave a glimpse into it. As a result, a completely unexpected picture emerged: amid the primordial chaos of the most diverse, for the most part contradictory judgments, one clear concept was outlined, which is natural to consider the expression of the views of an established, cohesive current. It attracted many authors, it is supported by the majority of Russian-language émigré magazines, it was accepted by Western sociologists, historians and the media in assessing Russian history and the current state of our country. Taking a closer look, you can see that the same views are widely spread in our life: they can be found in the theater, cinema, songs of bards, pop storytellers and even in anecdotes.

This work arose as an attempt to understand for oneself the reasons that caused this current, and the goals that it sets for itself. However, as will be seen later, here we inevitably come across one issue that is under an absolute ban in all modern humanity. Although there is no such prohibition in any set of laws, although it is not written down anywhere and is not even expressed, everyone knows about it, and everyone humbly stops their thought in front of the forbidden line. But it will not always be so, mankind will not walk forever in such a spiritual yoke! In the hope of a possible reader at least in the future, this work was written (and partly for myself, in order to sort out my thoughts).

In the clearest, most complete form, the current of interest to us is reflected in literary production - and we will most often use it as sources. Let us indicate more specifically what kind of literature we are talking about. It is very extensive and grows from year to year, so we will name only the main works to outline its contours. The beginning can be

considered the appearance in Samizdat of a collection of essays by G. Pomerants [Let us give the most brief information about the authors of those works that will be discussed here: G. Pomerants is a Soviet orientalist. During Stalin's time he was arrested. He expounded his historical and social views in collections of works distributed in Samizdat, and then published in the West, as well as in lectures and reports at seminars. Several of his articles appeared in the West in journals published in Russian] and articles by A.A. Amalrik [A. Amalrik studied at the Faculty of History of Moscow State University, then changed a number of professions. Soon after the publication of the above work, he was arrested and sentenced to three years, and when he almost served the term, he was again convicted by the camp court. After a statement clarifying his views, he was amnestied and emigrated] at the end of the 60s. The main provisions, then repeated in almost all other works, were more fully developed in four pseudonymous articles written here and published in the Russian journal Vestnik Russian Student Christian Movement published in Paris. Explaining the principled, programmatic nature of these works, the editorial preceded: "These are no longer voices, but a voice not in general about what is happening in Russia, but deep meditation on its past, future and present in the light of Christian revelation. and wrote in émigré magazines] "Detente after Brezhnev" and "New Russian Rights". Similar views have developed in most of the works of contemporary Western specialists in the history of Russia. We will take as an example the book by R. Pipes [R. Pipes is a native of Poland, an American historian. He is considered a leading specialist in Russian history and a Sovietologist. R. Reagan's closest adviser to President Reagan] "Russia under the old regime", which is especially closely related to the direction of interest to us in its basic principles. Finally, many articles of the same spirit have appeared in magazines founded in the West by recent emigrants from the USSR: Syntaxis (Paris), Time and We (Tel Aviv), Continent (Paris), and in Western magazines and newspapers. We will take as an example the book by R. Pipes [R. Pipes is a native of Poland, an American historian. He is considered a leading specialist in Russian history and a Sovietologist. R. Reagan's closest adviser to President Reagan] "Russia under the old regime", which is especially closely related to the direction of interest to us in its basic principles. Finally, many articles of the same spirit have appeared in magazines founded in the West by recent emigrants from the USSR: Syntaxis (Paris), Time and We (Tel Aviv), Continent (Paris), and in Western magazines and newspapers. We will take as an example the book by R. Pipes [R. Pipes is a native of Poland, an American historian. He is considered a leading specialist in Russian history and a Sovietologist. R. Reagan's closest adviser to President Reagan] "Russia under the old regime", which is especially closely related to the direction of interest to us in its basic principles. Finally, many articles of the same spirit have appeared in magazines founded in the West by recent emigrants from the USSR: Syntaxis (Paris), Time and We (Tel Aviv), Continent (Paris), and in Western magazines and newspapers. especially closely adjacent to the direction of interest to us in its basic principles. Finally, many articles of the same spirit have appeared in magazines founded in the West by recent emigrants from the USSR: Syntaxis (Paris), Time and We (Tel Aviv), Continent (Paris), and in Western magazines and newspapers. especially closely adjacent to the direction of interest to us in its basic principles. Finally, many articles of the same spirit appeared in magazines founded in

the West by recent emigrants from the USSR: Syntaxis (Paris), Vremya i us (Tel Aviv), Continent (Paris), and in Western magazines and newspapers.

Here is a very succinct summary of the main points expressed in these publications.

The history of Russia, starting from the early Middle Ages, is determined by some "archetypal" Russian features: slavish psychology, lack of self-esteem, intolerance of other people's opinions, a lackey mixture of anger, envy and admiration for someone else's power.

Since ancient times, Russians have come to love strong, cruel power and its very cruelty; throughout their history, they have tended to slavishly submit to force. Until now, power, "longing for the Master" dominates in the psyche of the people.

In parallel, since the 15th century, Russian history has been permeated with dreams of some role or mission of Russia in the world, a desire to teach others something, to indicate a new path, or even to save the world. This is "Russian messianism" (or, more simply, "universal Russian arrogance"), the origin of which the authors see in the concept of "Moscow - the Third Rome" expressed in the 16th century, and the modern stage in the idea of a world socialist revolution started by Russia.

As a result, Russia all the time finds itself at the mercy of despotic regimes, bloody cataclysms. Proof - the era of Grozny, Peter I, Stalin.

But the Russians are unable to understand the cause of their misfortunes. Being suspicious and hostile to everything alien, they tend to blame anyone for their troubles: Tatars, Greeks, Germans, Jews ... just not themselves.

The revolution of 1917 naturally follows from the whole of Russian history. In essence, it was not Marxist, Marxism was perverted by the Russians, altered and used to restore the old Russian traditions of strong power. The atrocities of the revolutionary era and the Stalinist period are explained by the peculiarities of the Russian national character. Stalin was a very national, very Russian phenomenon, his policy is a direct continuation of the barbaric history of Russia. "Stalinism" can be traced in Russian history at least four centuries ago.

The same trends continue to show today. Freed from the alien and incomprehensible Europeanized culture, the country is becoming more and more similar to the Muscovy. The main danger now hanging over our country is the resurgent attempts to find some own, original path of development - this is a manifestation of the age-old "Russian messianism." Such an attempt will inevitably entail the rise of Russian nationalism, the revival of Stalinism and a wave of anti-Semitism. It is mortally dangerous not only for the peoples of the USSR, but also for all mankind. The only salvation lies in realizing the disastrous nature of these trends, in eradicating them and building a society on the exact model of modern Western democracies.

Some authors of this trend express an uncompromisingly pessimistic point of view, which excludes hope for any meaningful existence for the Russians: they never had history at all, there was only "being outside of history", the people turned out to be an imaginary magnitude, the Russians only demonstrated their historical impotence, Russia is doomed to rapid decay and destruction.

This is just the roughest scheme. Further in the course of our research, we will have to cite a lot of the authors of the direction under consideration. Hopefully, the reader will then be able to more clearly feel the spirit of these works and the tone in which they are written.

Such energetic literary activity with clearly outlined views undoubtedly reflects the mood of a much wider circle than only the authors of the works: it expresses the ideology of an active, significant movement. This trend has already subjugated the public opinion of the West. By offering clear, simple answers to central questions related to our history and future, it may at some point have a decisive impact on the life of our country. Of course, history is not driven by theories and concepts, but much deeper and less rational experiences associated with the spiritual life of the people and their historical experience. Probably, that attitude to the history and fate of our people, those attitudes that are most important for our future, ripen for centuries, continue to be created now - and are stored somewhere in the depths of souls. But while all these features of the national character, traditions, feelings have not found an outlet in the sphere of reason, they remain amorphous and not very effective. They must be concretized, connected with real life problems. On the other hand, a clear, categorical, vividly formulated scheme can capture for a while the consciousness of the people, even being completely alien to its spiritual makeup - if its consciousness is not protected, not prepared to face such schemes. Therefore, it would be so important to understand and evaluate this new trend in the field of worldview. It is the current itself and the social stratum that gave birth to it that will be of primary interest to us, and the literature created by it will be used only as material for its analysis. The authors whom we will cite are hardly widely known even now, and in ten years from now, perhaps no one will know them.

The work plan is as follows. The views outlined above are grouped around two themes: an assessment of our history and an assessment of our future. We will analyze them, dividing them according to this criterion, in the next two paragraphs. In the rest of this work, we will try to understand the origin of these views: what spiritual trend and why could have generated them?

References to the sources from which the cited citations are borrowed are referred to the "Bibliographic Notes" at the end of the work.

§ 2. A LOOK AT RUSSIAN HISTORY

We must start, of course, by discussing the specific arguments with which the authors of the trend under consideration support their views. This discussion has been undertaken more than once, and it makes my task easier. Here is a brief overview of the thoughts expressed.

The theses declared by many authors about the "slave soul" of the Russian man, that in him his own dignity was less developed than among the inhabitants of the West, is difficult to back up with any facts. Pushkin, for example, believed that the relationship was the opposite. The opinions of visiting foreigners who saw Asian despotism in Russia and slaves in its inhabitants can be contrasted with the opinions of other foreigners who were amazed at the dignity of the Russian peasantry or even saw in Russia "an ideal country full of honesty and simplicity." Most likely, both of them knew very little about real Russia.

The attitude to power in Muscovite Rus does not in any way coincide with "slave submission". The term "autocrat", which was included in the title of the Russian tsar, did not mean recognition of his right to arbitrariness and irresponsibility, but expressed only that he was a sovereign, not a tributary of anyone (specifically, a khan). According to the ideas of that time, the king was responsible before God, religious and moral norms, and the king who violated them should not obey, going, if necessary, to torment and death.

A striking example of the tsar's condemnation is the assessment of Grozny not only in the annals, but also in folk legends, one of which, for example, says that "the tsar deceived God." Also, Peter I was known among the people as the Antichrist, and Alexei was a martyr for the faith.

The concept of "Moscow - the Third Rome", formulated at the beginning of the 16th century by the Pskov monk Philotheus, reflected the historical situation of that time. After the Florentine union of Byzantium with Catholicism and the fall of Constantinople, Russia remained the only Orthodox kingdom. The author calls on the Russian tsar to realize his responsibility in this new situation. He recalls the fate of the First Rome and the Second (Constantinople), who perished, in his opinion, due to falling away from the true faith, and predicts that the Russian kingdom will stand forever if it remains faithful to Orthodoxy. This theory had no political aspect, did not push Russia towards any expansion or Orthodox missionaryism. In the popular consciousness (for example, in folklore), it was not reflected in any way. The claim that the idea of the "Third Rome" and the revolutionary Marxist ideology of the 20th century constitute a single tradition, belongs to Berdyaev, who, apparently, was especially captivated by the consonance of the Third Rome with the Third International. But neither he nor anyone else tried to explain how this concept was transmitted over 400 years, without manifesting itself in any way during this time. [Unlike Berdyaev and the authors cited above who repeat his thought, modern professional historians, apparently, do not support this concept. The vast literature devoted to this issue converges on the

recognition that the concept of "Moscow-Third Rome" even in the 16th century did not in any way influence the political thought of the Muscovite kingdom, and its last traces are found in the 17th century] especially captivated by the consonance of the Third Rome with the Third International. But neither he nor anyone else tried to explain how this concept was transmitted over 400 years, without manifesting itself in any way during this time. [Unlike Berdyaev and the authors cited above who repeat his thought, modern professional historians, apparently, do not support this concept. The vast literature devoted to this issue converges on the recognition that the concept of "Moscow-Third Rome" even in the 16th century did not in any way influence the political thought of the Muscovite kingdom, and its last traces are found in the 17th century] especially captivated by the consonance of the Third Rome with the Third International. But neither he nor anyone else tried to explain how this concept was transmitted over 400 years, without manifesting itself in any way during this time. [Unlike Berdyaev and the authors cited above who repeat his thought, modern professional historians, apparently, do not support this concept. The vast literature devoted to this issue converges on the recognition that the concept of "Moscow-Third Rome" even in the 16th century did not in any way influence the political thought of the Muscovite kingdom, and its last traces are found in the 17th century] [Unlike Berdyaev and the authors cited above who repeat his thought, modern professional historians, apparently, do not support this concept. The vast literature devoted to this issue converges on the recognition that the concept of "Moscow-Third Rome" even in the 16th century did not in any way influence the political thought of the Muscovite kingdom, and its last traces are found in the 17th century] [Unlike Berdyaev and the authors cited above who repeat his thought, modern professional historians, apparently, do not support this concept. The vast literature devoted to this issue converges on the recognition that the concept of "Moscow-Third Rome" even in the 16th century did not in any way influence the political thought of the Muscovite kingdom, and its last traces are found in the 17th century] [Unlike Berdyaev and the authors cited above who repeat his thought, modern professional historians, apparently, do not support this concept. The vast literature devoted to this issue converges on the recognition that the concept of "Moscow-Third Rome" even in the 16th century did not in any way influence the political thought of the Muscovite kingdom, and its last traces are found in the 17th century]

No hatred of foreigners and foreign influences, specific to Russians, which would distinguish them from other peoples, cannot be found. There were strong fears for the purity of their faith, suspicion of Protestant and Catholic missionary activities. Here you can see a certain religious intolerance, but this feature does not in any way distinguish Russia of that time from the West, the level of religious tolerance of which is characterized by the Inquisition, St. Bartholomew's Night and the Thirty Years War.

To reduce the entire pre-revolutionary history to Ivan the Terrible and Peter is a schematization that completely distorts the picture. It is like presenting the history of France consisting only of the executions of Louis XI, the St. Bartholomew's night, the persecution of Protestants under Louis XIV and revolutionary terror. Such a collection of pulled out facts cannot prove anything. Nor does it prove the thesis that the Revolution was a specifically Russian phenomenon, a natural consequence of Russian history. And if this were so, how could one explain the revolution in China or Cuba, the rule of Marxism over the minds of the Western intelligentsia, the influence of the communist parties of France and Italy?

To these arguments, borrowed from the works mentioned above, I will add several of my own in order to draw attention to one important aspect of the issue.

1. How little the attitude of the Russian pre-Petrine era to the authorities resembled "slavish obedience", "the desire to think and feel the same with it," - the Schism shows, when the minor, dogmatic changes in rituals introduced by the authorities were not accepted by a large part of the nation, thousands of people fled to the forests, went to torment and death, burned themselves - and for 300 years the problem has not lost its acuteness. It is interesting to compare this with a similar situation in a classical country that has established the principle of personal freedom and human rights - England. Henry VIII tailored a completely new religion, taking something from Catholicism, something from Protestantism, and even redrawing it several times, so that in the end his subjects no longer knew very well what they should believe. And now - the parliament and the clergy turned out to be submissive, the majority of the people accepted this religion, composed for political and personal reasons. Of course, in Western Europe of the XVI-XVII centuries, religious divisions played no less role than in our country, but they, apparently, were more intertwined with political and material interests. Thus, R. Pipes is amazed: "The secularization of church lands (in Russia in the 17th century - I. Sh.) - perhaps the most compelling reason for the European Reformation - took place in Russia so calmly, as if it were a simple accounting transaction." It would be inconceivable in Russia at that time to be the situation fixed by the Augsburg religious world, expressed by the formula "kuyus regio, eyus religio" (whose power, that and religion), when the faith of the subjects was determined by their secular rulers. Some of the authors of the trend under consideration consider the subordination of the Church to the state in the form of synodal administration of the church, introduced by Peter I. In the cited book of R. Pipes, one chapter is called "The Church - Servant of the State." A. Shragin writes: "The most vivid and, so to speak, archetypically [We keep the spelling of the original, although we are talking, apparently, about the concept of an archetype belonging to K. Jung] Russian psychological predisposition to unanimous obedience affected the subordination of the church to the state in those forms, which it took in the synodal period. " Already they, the historian and the philosopher, should be perfectly aware that these forms of subordination of the church to the state arose in Protestant countries,

2. Another interesting observation is connected with the point of view expressed by R. Pipes. He believes that the legislation of Nicholas I served as a model for the Soviet, from which, in turn, Hitler allegedly copied the laws of the "Third Reich" (!), So that the legislation of Nicholas' times turns out to be the source of all anti-liberal movements of the 20th century. He even proclaims that the significance of the Nikolaev legislation for totalitarianism is comparable to the significance of the Magna Carta for democracy! R. Pipes's concept, of course, is just an anecdote, typical, however, for his entire book, but it is interesting that a closer examination of this issue leads to conclusions that are directly opposite to those to which he is drawn. The whole concept of a totalitarian state (both in the monarchical and in its democratic version), subordinating to itself not only the economic and political activities of its subjects, but also their intellectual and spiritual life, was fully developed in the West - and if it had not been so deeply developed, it

could not have been implemented [This was brought to my attention many years ago Al Lapin]. So, back in the 17th century, Hobbes depicted the state as a single being, Leviathan, "artificial man", "mortal God." He refers to him the words of the Bible: "There is no one like him on earth, he was created fearless. He looks boldly at everything high; he is the king over all the sons of pride." More specifically, the "Sovereign" has power that is not based on any conditions. Everything he does is fair and lawful. He can dispose of the property and honor of his subjects, be the judge of all teachings and thoughts, in particular, and in matters of religion. Among the main dangers for the state, Hobbes considers the opinion ("disease") that the private person is the judge of what actions are good and what are bad, and that everything that a person does against his conscience is a sin. The attitude of subjects to the "Sovereign", in his opinion, is best expressed by the words "you will be his slaves." In the same century, Spinoza proves that moral categories are generally not applicable to state power, the state, in principle, cannot commit crimes, it has every right to violate treaties, attack allies, etc. In turn, any decision of the state that just and not just, should be the law for all subjects. In the 18th century, Rousseau developed a democratic version of this concept. He believes that the supreme power belongs to the people (also called the Sovereign), and now HE forms a "collective being" in which separate individuals completely dissolve. The Sovereign again belongs to unlimited power over the property and personality of citizens, he cannot be wrong, etc. From the Sovereign, each individual "receives his life and his being", the Sovereign must change the "physical existence" of a person to "partial existence."

"It is necessary that he took away from a person his own powers and gave in return others that would be alien to him and which he could not use without the assistance of others."

What could have been added here by the legislation of Nicholas I, so pale against such a background! Yes, you can clearly trace how these principles were borrowed in Russia from the West. The provision that the subjects renounced their will and gave it to the monarch, who can command them whatever they want, is expressed in the "Truth of the monarchs' will", compiled by Feofan Prokopovich on behalf of Peter. It quotes Hobbes almost word for word with all the main elements of his theory, such as the "pact" between subjects, renouncing their will and giving it to the monarch.

3. "Messianism", that is, the belief of a certain social group (nation, church, class, party ...) that it is destined to determine the fate of mankind, to become its savior, is a very old phenomenon. A classic example, from which the name itself came, is the teaching of the Messiah (the anointed one) contained in Judaism, who will establish the authority of the "chosen people" over the world. This concept has arisen in so many social movements and teachings. The Marxist doctrine of the special role of the proletariat belongs to the tradition of "revolutionary messianism" that developed in Europe in the 19th century. A recent very thorough study of this tradition describes its various stages (Saint-Simon, Fourier ...) right up to the concept of the "Third Rome" (Roma Terzio in Mazzini), but mentions Russia only at the very end of the book, due to the fact that

4. Finally, the thesis that the revolution in Russia was predetermined by the entire course of Russian history, it would be necessary to check on the question of the origin of Russian SOCIALISM, since without this ingredient such a radical change in the entire social and spiritual way of life would be impossible - which is proved by numerous precedents, even our Time of Troubles. Socialism, apparently, had no roots in the Russian tradition.

up to the 19th century. In Russia, there were no authors like Mora and Campanella. Radical sectarianism, which in Western Europe was the breeding ground for socialist ideas, played a much lesser role in Russia, and only in extremely rare cases in heretical teachings there are views that could be considered the predecessors of socialist concepts (for example, the desire for community of property). Moreover, this applies to attempts to translate such views into reality: there was nothing even remotely reminiscent of the "Munster Commune" in Russia. Another source in which one could look for the embryos of socialist ideas - popular social utopias - also does not provide anything on which the socialist tradition could rely. They amaze with their softness, lack of belligerent aggressiveness. This is the condemnation of Evil,

Socialism was completely introduced to Russia from the West. In the 19th century, he was so unambiguously perceived as something foreign that, speaking of contemporary socialist teachings, Dostoevsky often called them "French socialism." And the founders of the movement are two emigrants - Bakunin and Herzen, who began to develop socialist ideas only after they emigrated to the West. But Western society of a new, post-Renaissance type was born with the dream of socialism, reflected in Mora's Utopia, Campanella's City of the Sun and the whole stream of socialist literature.

Thus, many of the phenomena that the authors of the trend under consideration declare as typically Russian, turn out to be not only not typical for Russia, but also generally non-Russian in origin, brought from the West: this is, as it were, a payment for Russia's entry into the sphere of a new Western culture.

There are many more arguments of this kind, but these are probably enough to give an assessment of the concept we are discussing: IT COMPLETELY DISSOLVES AT ANY ATTEMPT TO COMPARE IT WITH THE FACTS.

Let's pay attention to one more feature of the works we are considering: their indifference to the factual side of the matter, the use of surprisingly lightweight arguments, so that a moment's reflection should have made it obvious for the authors that they are inconsistent. For example, Pomerantz cites as an example of how the Russian soul "revels in the cruelty of power", "The Tale of Dracula", circulated in the lists in the 16th century, while it is devoted to the exposure of cruelty, in some lists Dracula is called the devil. In one of the works devoted to the criticism of this concept, this circumstance is indicated. But in the samizdat "anti-criticism" that appeared later, Pomerantz declares that he does not particularly insist on his interpretation of the story. But, he says, he knew one author, who signed his samizdat works with the

pseudonym "Skuratov". So the adherence of the Russians to the brutal government has been proven anyway!

One reasoning of R. Pipes implies that he believes that private property did not exist in Muscovite Rus! Elsewhere in his book, he cites the proverb "Someone else's tears - water" as proof of the "cruel cynicism" and selfishness of Russian peasants. Apparently, he understood it not as a condemnation of selfishness, but as a moral maxim. He also claims that there were no schools in pre-Petrine Russia, and the overwhelming majority of the service class was illiterate. But back in 1892 A. I. Sobolevsky wrote: "We used to think that among the Russians of this time (XV-XVII centuries) there were very few literate, that the clergy were illiterate, partly illiterate, that literacy in the upper secular class was poorly spread that the lower class represented the illiterate mass. " He gives numerous calculations, from which it follows that the white clergy were all literate, among the monks the percentage of literate was at least 75, among the farmers at least 50, among the townspeople - 20, among the peasants (in the 17th century) - 15, throughout the country there were many "schools" for literacy training. According to D.S.Likhachev, the literacy level in Russia in the 17th century. in all segments of the population was no lower than in the West. And now the prejudice refuted 70 years ago is now being repeated by the leading US expert on Russian history!

There are especially many such passages in the works of A. Yanov (perhaps for the reason that he often draws on specific arguments, while other authors mostly confine themselves to declarations). So he believes that the "GULAG Archipelago" is a constant companion of Russian history, periodically manifested in it, and indicates 1825 as the date of its previous appearance. At first you will not even understand that we are talking about an uprising of the Decembrists - an attempt to armed overthrow of the government and the assassination of the tsar (and according to some plans - the extermination of the entire royal house), when the governor-general of St. Petersburg Miloradovich was killed - and as a result 5 people were executed and about a hundred were exiled. Despite the fact that at the same time in Spain, Naples, Sicily, Piedmont and Lombardy, the same attempts at military coups were made (1820-1823), accompanied by the same executions after the suppression. In England, in 1820, the Thistlewood conspiracy was discovered, which aimed to assassinate members of the cabinet. Five leaders of the conspiracy were executed, the rest of the participants were exiled to hard labor in the colony. So there is nothing typical of Russian history here at all. Not "backward" Russia, but "advanced" France showed how to deal with such indignations! - thousands were shot after the suppression of the uprising in Paris in 1848, tens of thousands - after the suppression of the Paris Commune. and "advanced" France has shown how to deal with such indignations! - thousands were shot after the suppression of the uprising in Paris in 1848, tens of thousands - after the suppression of the Paris Commune. and "advanced" France has shown how to deal with such indignations! - thousands were shot after the suppression of the uprising in Paris in 1848, tens of thousands - after the suppression of the Paris Commune.

Or, wanting to show that even the seemingly most innocent Russian national currents, like Slavophilism, lead to Black Hundreds and pogroms, he considers only Danilevsky,

Leontyev, a third-rate publicist of the beginning of this century, Sharapov, and a very dark the intriguer VI Lvov, whom for some reason he calls the prince (the chief prosecutor of the Synod in the Provisional Government, who emigrated, then returned and finally joined the "Union of Militant Atheists"!). But if he considered that the ideas of the Slavophiles were developed by Dostoevsky as a writer, Solovov as a philosopher, Tikhomirov as a publicist, A. Koshelev, Y. Samarin and other leaders of the reform era, and later D. Shipov as a politician, then the picture turned out would be completely different, and with one more selection - a third. Here's a trick,

When discussing the acceptability of a democratic form of government for Russia, Yanov assesses some of the shortcomings of this system to the fact that "democracy as a political invention is still a child. It is not 1000 years old, but only 200 years old." It is difficult to imagine a person who talks about history and has not heard of democracy in Greece, Rome or Florence, who has not read the pages dedicated to it by Thucydides, Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, Machiavelli! Finally - already quite a curiosity - Yanov refers Belinsky to the "classics of Slavophilism"! For such an answer, the student will receive a two, and this is written by a candidate of sciences and now a professor at the University of Berkeley.

We involuntarily come to a question, on the answer to which the entire further direction of our reflections depends: are these authors interested in truth at all? The question is unpleasant, there are "rules of the game" according to which arguments should be discussed, and not the conscientiousness and motives of the opponent. So disgusted was the posing of the question: "Who benefits from this?" Therefore, before going further, let us check our doubts on one more example: on the assertion found in almost all the analyzed works - about cruelty, barbarity, allegedly specific for the whole of Russian history.

As if there was a people who cannot be blamed for this! The Assyrians covered the walls of the conquered cities with the skins of their inhabitants. In the Bible we read:

"And they put to a curse all that was in the city, and men and women, and young and old, and oxen, and sheep, and donkeys, they destroyed all with the sword."
(Book of Joshua, VI, 20)

And about King David:

"And the people that were in it, he brought out, and put them under the saws, under the iron threshers, under the iron axes, and threw them into the kilns. So he did with all the cities of the Ammonites."
(2nd Book of Kings, XII, 31)

And the bright, beautiful Greeks during internecine wars destroyed the population of entire cities (by their scale - states): all men were killed, and women and children were sold into slavery. And so it goes through the whole of History: not only in the dark Middle Ages, but also in the era of the triumph of Reason. Cromwell destroyed a third of

the Irish population, and only an uprising in Scotland prevented him from carrying out his original plan - to do away with the Irish as a nation. In the United States, the pious Puritans exterminated the Indians like wolves: a scalp was charged. And the slave trade, in which kings participated, which parliaments defended by citing human rights - and which cost Africa 100 million lives! And the French Revolution, the number of victims of which was estimated by some contemporaries at 1 million, was when the entire population of France was 26 million! And finally, Hitler! Of course, there was a lot of cruelty in our history, but you need to completely forget about conscientiousness in order to attribute cruelty to us as some specific feature! There is, it seems, not a single of our authors who would not remember oprichnina with triumph! But a modern historian, who specially investigated the number of victims of the oprichnina, writes: "Traditional ideas about the scale of the oprichnina terror need to be revised. The data on the deaths of many tens of thousands of people are extremely exaggerated. 4 thousand people ". (We are talking, of course, about the number of those killed. Famine, epidemics, raids of Crimeans and flight from unbearable extortions reduced the population of central Russia by hundreds of thousands.) And on St. Bartholomew's night, close in time,

The authors consider Russian history exclusively in the plane of modern consciousness, completely ignoring the requirements of historicism. But they are all people with a liberal arts education; the facts that we have recalled above should be well known to most of them. Those who do not know them could easily recognize them if they were really interested in facts. We have to admit that we are not dealing here with sincere attempts to understand the meaning of history, not with "historiosophical reflections." Before us is an activity of a completely different type: it is journalistic journalism, propaganda, which seeks to inspire the reader with some predetermined thoughts and feelings. But then it should be investigated as propaganda. And any propaganda has a specific PURPOSE. We come to the most important question: what is the purpose of all this literature,

It would be possible not to puzzle over this question if we were dealing simply with emigrant emotions. But further we will make sure that this is not the case. We just see the tip of the iceberg: the fact that the literature in question is mostly published in the West is explained only by the fact that it is safer and easier to publish there. And these sentiments themselves are rooted here, and even here they are manifested, although not so straightforwardly. After all, one must be aware that if this concept is absorbed into the national consciousness, then it will be tantamount to spiritual death: the people, evaluating their history in this way, cannot exist. So we are dealing here with some phenomenon that deeply affects us, the inhabitants of this country.

§ 3. PLANS FOR RUSSIA

An examination of the second group of views developed by the authors of the direction we are interested in will help to answer the question posed at the end of the previous section: how the current situation of the country is assessed and what paths are proposed for the future. If our assumption is correct that interest in Ancient Russia, Elder Philotheus, Terrible, Peresvet, etc. is determined not by the authors' inclination to historical research, but by some very topical interests and feelings, it is obvious that their judgments about modernity should especially clarify their motives.

All the points of view expressed here are concentrated mainly around two provisions: the danger, the inadmissibility of the influence of the Russian national principle on the life of the state, and the need to accurately follow the model of modern Western democracies in building society.

The authors react very painfully and sharply to any attempts to look at life from the Russian national point of view, i.e. approach today's problems from the point of view of Russian spiritual and historical traditions.

... not a national revival, but the struggle for freedom and spiritual values should become the central creative idea of our future. (Gorsky, pseudonym)

The same author warns:

The new national consciousness should not be built on unconscious patriotism ... (as it seems to have been built among the 20 million [according to some reports, much more], who laid down their heads in the last war). The author considers a dangerous temptation to think about the MEANING of the existence of Russia, i.e. the very presumption of meaningfulness of Russian fate. With condemnation, he says:

"A Russian person, if he is only able to think independently, is still tormented by the question: what is Russia? What is the meaning of its existence? What is its purpose and place in world history?"

(It is interesting that according to the meaning of this phrase, Gorsky himself does not classify himself as a "Russian people", at least, "independently thinking"!).

Yanov is very sympathetic to the anonymous authors who appeared in Vestnik RSKhD No. 97 (Gorskii and others). He even believes that the future of Russia largely depends on the political orientation of the Russian Orthodox Renaissance movement. Here he distinguishes two directions: one, close to him in spirit, to which the mentioned authors belong, he calls "liberal-ecumenical". It is difficult to put other content into this cautious and delicate turn of speech, apart from non-nationality. And in the preface to another book by Yanov, Breslauer emphasizes that Yanov's sympathies are on the side of the COSMOPOLITICAL stratum of Soviet society. It is necessary to somehow name

another direction in the "Orthodox Renaissance", in its meaning it is NATIONAL, but here Yanov cannot stand the role of a professor,

In this opposition, Yanov sees the main problem of modern Soviet life: "the decisive dividing line is between nationalists and non-nationalists." It is unnecessary to stipulate that "nationalism" does not mean Armenian, Lithuanian or Jewish, but only Russian. And it is obvious which side of the watershed the author is on. Moreover, he accuses his opponents of the fact that if their ideas about the future Russia were realized, then there would be no place for the ANTIRUSSIAN OPPOSITION! I don't presume to judge whether this accusation is fair, but it very clearly demonstrates the author's concerns.

Yanov's concepts are manifested with the utmost clarity in his polemics with the samizdat magazine Veche, published in the early 1970s. As an illustration of the "blind refusal to see what is happening," he quotes an article from this magazine: "Even the problem of civil rights in the USSR is LESS important at this historical moment than the problem of the dying Russian nation." It is instructive to be aware of Yanov's own position. If this point of view is not correct and the "problem of the dying Russian nation" is less important, then what will happen if we concentrate our efforts on a more important problem, and the nation perishes? (The cited article claims that the number of Russians is declining.) Whose rights should we fight for then? Certainly, not for the rights of the Russians!

Finally, this issue is discussed again at a higher level. Concerning one samizdat article, Yanov writes:

At the risk of profaning the metaphysical enthusiasm of the article, let us simply formulate its meaning: humanity is quantized, so to speak, not into individual individuals, as the "humanistic consciousness" has naively believed until now, but into nations.

However, the "profanation of metaphysical enthusiasm" has nothing to do with it; what Yanov does is called much simpler: the substitution of one thought for another. In an excerpt from the article under discussion, which Yanov himself cites before the passage cited above, it says: "nations are ONE of the levels in the hierarchy of the Christian cosmos ..." Yanova, humanity is quantized AND ON THE NATION. The opposite point of view, which, apparently, Yanov adheres to, is that humanity is quantized ONLY ON INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITIES, and not on the nation. The point of view is not new. Humanity, scattered (or "quantum") on nothing with each other individuals, - this, apparently, is the ideal of Yanov.

But there is an even more radical line of thought. Instead of fighting nationalism, warning about its danger, it is argued that there is nothing to dispute and talk about, since there is NO PEOPLE AT ALL. We have already cited the statement: "the people turned out to be an imaginary size" ("Gorsky"). Pomerantz developed this idea in particular detail and with love:

The people are gone. There is a mass that retains a vague memory that once it was a people and carried God in itself, and now it is completely empty.

There is no people at all, in the sense of a God-bearing people, a source of spiritual values. There are neurasthenic intellectuals - and the masses.

In our country there are only traces of the people, like traces of snow in spring.

What we usually call a people is not a people at all, but a philistine.

So, if in the past the Russian people did not have history, then in the present there is no longer the Russian people either ...

These thoughts naturally follow from the concepts discussed in the previous paragraph. In Russian history, the authors see nothing but tyranny, servility and senseless, bloody convulsions. Pomerantz explains:

This is how history is generally made in Russia. The Russian people tremble and retreat before the formidable autocrat, who cuts him into pieces, like Ivanushka, and bakes him anew. Then, when he is baked, he recognizes the owner as his own and serves faithfully!

Or in poetic form Galich:

No matter the year - hard times,
No matter what lies - the Messiah.

If we accept this view, then really an attempt to build the future on the basis of SUCH traditions can only end in one more disaster. The opinion of one of the authors that "Russia had no history," others, perhaps, would be dismissed as a polemical exaggeration, but, in fact, all their views lead to this conclusion: History, as the womb in which the future of the people is hatched, Russia, according to their point of view, did not. On what, then, should the future of this country be built? The answer is given by the second main thesis put forward by the literature we are considering: on the basis of someone else's experience, borrowing as an example modern Western multi-party democracy. The fact that this experience is someone else's, not growing organically from Russian history, makes it attractive, since it guarantees that it is not infected with those poisons that, according to the authors, are saturated. all of our past. On the contrary, the search for some path of their own will inevitably cause, as they believe, a chain of new catastrophes. Yanov, for example, considers this to be the main issue, "which now, like many generations ago, is shared by the Russian dissident movement - is Russia a European country, or does it have a special, its own path of development ..."

Thus, it is the SEARCH for one's own path (of course, without limiting its direction, so that, in particular, the result could be some kind of democracy of its own) is rejected here. The reason is that, according to the authors, in general, there are only two

solutions, the choice is possible only from two options: modern democracy of the Western type or totalitarianism. Speaking about the same basic question as in the passage just quoted, Yanov asks:

Is it not about looking for an alternative for European democracy? And does not such a search inevitably lead even the noblest and most honest thinkers into the arms of authoritarianism, for no "special" Russian alternative to democracy has ever been known in history. Further, does not the logic of the struggle against democracy (as a doctrine and as a political reality) ultimately lead to the justification of the most extreme, totalitarian forms of authoritarianism?

Let us note this characteristic feature, which will be further useful for analyzing the views of our authors: they offer a choice of only two possibilities - either "European democracy" or authoritarianism, and even in its "most extreme totalitarian" forms. It is unlikely that real life fits into such a simplified scheme. So many forces acted and are acting in society: monarchical power, aristocracy, bourgeoisie and other estates, church or churches, corporations, parties, national interests, etc. etc., that from their combinations a continuous spectrum of state forms can arise (and always appears), and not those two of its EXTREME points between which we are invited to choose. And often the mechanism by which state power is formed turns out to be far from the most important feature of society. Otherwise, we would have to recognize the Roman Empire in the "Golden Age of Antonines" and the Chinese empire of Qin Shi Huang Di with its universal slavery, mutual responsibility and burning of books as related. In our century, one-party states are both modern Yugoslavia and Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, and multi-party states are both South Africa and Switzerland. The system that existed in England when she defeated Louis XIV, withstood a quarter of a century of wars with revolutionary France and Napoleon, became the "workshop of Europe" and an example of a free society, was so different from modern democracy that it is hardly reasonable to combine them with one term. He relied on a very limited franchise. Parliament consisted of persons closely related by common interests and even kinship, the discussion in it was of a technical nature, and demagoguery, the desire to influence public opinion did not play a noticeable role. Sombart compares it to the advice of a joint-stock company, which discusses how to run an enterprise in the success of which everyone is equally interested and in whose affairs everyone is more or less knowledgeable. Most of the members of parliament were actually appointed by large landowners, and often seats were bought. And nevertheless, the Court of History showed that this parliament, to some extent, received the support of the people. In the same way as in 1912, the Russian people, apparently, unanimously supported the autocratic power, and the American people in the Vietnam War, which demanded very small sacrifices from them, refused to support the government elected according to all the canons of Western democracy. And how to assess who expressed the will of the American people to a greater extent: the party machine,

This raises a very deep problem. The search for a better way to reveal the will of the people tacitly presupposes that such a concept as "the will of the people" exists and is interpreted by everyone in the same way. Namely, this assumption, which is almost not

discussed, requires careful analysis. In modern scientific jargon, a people is a "big system." But not every large system has a property that could be called "will". For example, no matter how complex a computing machine, obviously, it does not possess it; it is completely unclear that it can be attributed to living nature as a whole, or to a separate species, or to a biocenosis - and only in relation to an individual person or higher animals, the presence of will does not cause us doubts. In real life, the people manifest themselves not by formulating their will, but uprisings or the rise of economic activity, the rise or fall of the birth rate, the rise of culture or the spread of alcoholism and drug addiction, perseverance and sacrifice in war or easy surrender. It is the innumerable set of such signs that shows whether the people's organism is healthy. To work out the most organic form of government for a given people and at a given moment in its history is, of course, a necessary condition for the healthy existence of a people. But it is far from the only and often not the most important thing. To work out the most organic form of government for a given people and at a given moment in its history is, of course, a necessary condition for the healthy existence of a people. But it is far from the only and often not the most important thing. To work out the most organic form of government for a given people and at a given moment in its history is, of course, a necessary condition for the healthy existence of a people. But it is far from the only and often not the most important thing.

As for the Western-type democracy, which the analyzed authors so persistently propose as a universal solution to all social problems, in its current state it raises a number of doubts that should be thoroughly discussed before recommending it unconditionally as the only solution to our problems. Let's discuss some of them.

1. This system, apparently, is not so natural. The transition to it was usually associated with a painful and bloody cataclysm: obviously, some kind of violence is needed over the natural historical process. Such was the English Civil War. In France, civil war and terror were just the beginning. For almost a century after that, the country was shaking like in a fever: the Napoleonic wars, revolutions, the second empire, the Commune. Our attempt to introduce this system in February 1917 was not successful. In Germany, such an attempt, carried out in the Weimar Republic, as a reaction led to the victory of National Socialism. (An adherent of democracy like Churchill, in his memoirs, expresses the opinion that the fate of Germany would have been different if the monarchy had been preserved in 1918.)

Is it possible now to take the risk of another similar cataclysm in our country? Is there a chance that she will outlive him? At the same time, our authors propose this path with an ease that raises the suspicion that such fears do not bother them at all.

2. The founders of Western liberal thought (for example, Montesquieu and the authors of the American Constitution) proceeded from the concept of limited power. This concept is rooted in the religious medieval worldview. In the era of absolutism, the doctrine of unlimited power was developed - first about the power of an unlimited monarch, and then about unlimited power by the people (see the thoughts of Hobbes, Spinoza and Rousseau, cited in the previous paragraph). They tried to achieve

restrictions on power on the basis of the principle of the division of powers: when, for example, legislation is not subject to the constitutional monarch or the judiciary is not subject to the will of the people. But for such a system to function, a force is needed that limits all these powers, and for this, society must often have unwritten and even unconscious norms of behavior, traditions, moral and religious principles, which in the scale of values occupy a higher place than the authority of any government, so that the actions of the authorities that contradict them are perceived as illegal. This is the only reliable way to limit power in its principle. The absence of such values, which are higher than the authority of the authorities, automatically generates a society of a totalitarian type. That is why states based on unlimited democracy so easily give rise to totalitarianism: in Germany, the Weimar Republic or in France, the power of the Constituent Assembly in 1789-1791. This pattern was noticed a long time ago. Plato wrote that democracy degenerates into tyranny. Both he and Aristotle believed that unlimited democracy in general cannot be considered a form of government. Edmund Burke, who observed the initial stage of the French Revolution, wrote, that unlimited democracy is just as oppressive as unlimited monarchy. Modern Western democracies are entirely based on the principle of unlimited democracy: any decision made by the majority of the population is legal. (This spirit was also captured by the authors we are examining: for example, the introduction to the collection "Democratic Alternatives" proclaims "democracy in the legal field," that is, the subordination of law to the decision of the majority.) Many liberal critics of modern democracy see this as a sign of its decline, failure attempts undertaken 200 years ago to build a free society on the principles of democracy. Now, according to them, freedoms in Western society exist by force of inertia, and not as a consequence of the principles on which this society is built. Modern Western democracies are entirely based on the principle of unlimited democracy: any decision made by the majority of the population is legal. (This spirit was also captured by the authors we are examining: for example, the introduction to the collection "Democratic Alternatives" proclaims "democracy in the legal field," that is, the subordination of law to the decision of the majority.) Many liberal critics of modern democracy see this as a sign of its decline, failure attempts undertaken 200 years ago to build a free society on the principles of democracy. Now, according to them, freedoms in Western society exist by force of inertia, and not as a consequence of the principles on which this society is built. (This spirit was also captured by the authors we are examining: for example, the introduction to the collection "Democratic Alternatives" proclaims "democracy in the legal field," that is, the subordination of law to the decision of the majority.) Many liberal critics of modern democracy see this as a sign of its decline, failure attempts undertaken 200 years ago to build a free society on the principles of democracy. Now, according to

them, freedoms in Western society exist by force of inertia, and not as a consequence of the principles on which this society is built. (This spirit was also captured by the authors we are examining: for example, the introduction to the collection "Democratic Alternatives" proclaims "democracy in the legal field," that is, the subordination of law to the decision of the majority.) Many liberal critics of modern democracy see this as a sign of its decline, failure attempts undertaken 200 years ago to build a free society on the principles of democracy. Now, according to them, freedoms in Western society exist by force of inertia, and not as a consequence of the principles on which this society is built. the failure of the attempt undertaken 200 years ago to build a free society on the principles of democracy. Now, according to them, freedoms in Western society exist by force of inertia, and not as a consequence of the principles on which this society is built. the failure of the attempt undertaken 200 years ago to build a free society on the principles of democracy. Now, according to them, freedoms in Western society exist by force of inertia, and not as a consequence of the principles on which this society is built.

3. The authors recommend Western-style democracy as an alternative to the one-party communist state. But is it capable of being such an alternative? After all, not by magic, one way of life will be replaced by another, obviously, some kind of competition is assumed. Is the democratic system in its present form capable of such competition? More and more Western democracy yields and yields to its antagonist. If the part of humanity inhabiting countries with a one-party communist state system was 7.5% in 1920 and 8.5% in 1940, then in 1960 it was more than 45%, and now it is no less than half. And the process was going in only one direction! Long gone is the time when Western democracies were a dynamic force, when the number of countries following this path grew, and they imposed their principles on others. Now it's the other way around! Of the newly emerging states, almost none have chosen a Western-style state system. And in the Western democracies themselves, the number of opponents of their state system is growing. Its supporters usually resort to the argument that, as bad as it is, the rest are even worse. Such an argument can hardly inspire anyone to defend this order. They didn't say that 200 years ago! If we draw the ancient democracy into comparison, we will see that it is a short-lived form. 200 years is the deadline for her life. But this is exactly how long multiparty democracy exists in Western Europe and the United States. By all indications, the multi-party Western system is a fading social order. Her role in History can be highly appreciated: she brought with her a guarantee of inner peace, protection from government terror (but not from "

And meanwhile, do the authors we are examining themselves have a definite idea of the "Western democracy" that we are offered to take or reject in a ready-made form, not allowing us to discuss its possible variants and alternatives? It seems from their works that this idea is very vague for them. They often seem to be referring to a classic form of multiparty democracy, such as the one currently in the United States (for example, Shragin or Yanov). But here, for example, Krasnov - Levitin [A. Krasnov (A. A. Levitin) - a church leader who in the 1920s took an active part in the movement of "renovationists" aimed at splitting the Orthodox Church: he was the secretary of the leader of this movement A. Vvedensky. After the movement of "renovationists" came to naught, he returned to the Orthodox Church. In connection with his church activities, he

was arrested. In the 1960s. protested against the mass closure of churches under Khrushchev. He was arrested again and sentenced to 3 years. After serving time, he emigrated. In several works he develops the idea of uniting Christianity with socialism] wants to introduce "complete property equality", and L. Plyushch [L. Plyushch is a Marxist, but critical of some aspects of Soviet life. He wrote several works in this spirit, was a member of the "Initiative Group for the Protection of Human Rights". He was arrested, declared insane and placed in a psychiatric hospital. His arrest caused a wide movement in the West: even the leader of the French Communist Party protested. Ivy was released, emigrated and continues to develop his Marxist views in the West.] Asserts, that state planning should be preserved until the achievement of communism: but such goals are by no means set by modern Western democracy! Moreover, Ivy writes:

I don't understand you if you don't sympathize with the terrorists who are destroying the executioners of their people. Individual terror is immoral when directed against innocent people.

It is impossible to assume that the author has such a degree of intellectual underdevelopment that he does not ask the question: WHO will divide into "innocent" and "guilty"? Until now, the terrorists have never resorted to arbitration, but administered it themselves. Probably, the Basque terrorists (whom Ivy cites with sympathy as an example), shooting at the police officer, believe that he is guilty, if not personally, then as a representative of the guilty state. But any class or racial terror is based on such views. Obviously, here we have, though still timid, an apology for political terror, but then how can this be connected with the ideals of Western democracy? And most of the authors of the collection "Democratic Alternatives" express their commitment to socialism, and the collection ends with a document " but a certain ALTERNATIVE to her, that is, exactly what Yanov is so passionately fighting against. How, then, can we understand his participation in this collection? If he considers it such a decisive argument that "no special Russian alternative to democracy has been known in history until now," then should he not, first of all, turn with this argument to his associates and co-authors in the collection, for after all, synthesis democracy of the Western type with socialism (for example, with "full property equality") in history, of course, has not yet been known? but a certain ALTERNATIVE to her, that is, exactly what Yanov is so passionately fighting against. How, then, can we understand his participation in this collection? If he considers it such a decisive argument that "no special Russian alternative to democracy has been known in history until now," then should he not, first of all, turn with this argument to his associates and co-authors in the collection, for after all, synthesis democracy of the Western type with socialism (for example, with "full property equality") in history, of course, has not yet been known?

So, apparently, it is not the gravitation towards democracy, understood by them very ambiguously, that unites these authors. And what they all really have in common is the irritation that arises at the thought that Russia can SEARCH for some OWN WAY in history, the desire by all means to prevent the people from following the path that they

themselves will develop and choose (of course, not with the help of secret ballot, but through their historical experience). This is the dream of turning Russia into a mechanism, a robot, devoid of all elements of life (historical traditions, any goals in the future) and controlled by a program made far away from the world and a program embedded in it ... Democracy plays the role of such a "program", "managing devices ", in no way organically connected with the country. So if you make a fantastic guess,

The same scheme, the same idea of the ghostly nature of our life, which is only a pale REFLECTION of real Western life, takes on a somewhat grotesque character in the article by Pomerants in the collection "Self-Consciousness". Interpreting the development of the culture of ALL countries of the world, except England, Holland, Scandinavia and France, only as a SKOLOK from the culture of these latter, the author emphasizes what distortions, the loss of whole stages and the merging of several into one at the same time. But he is not trying to discuss his axiom. But if he took it as an axiom that European poetry is a distorted copy of Persian, then he probably would have had to resort to even more ingenious constructions to explain why Ferdowsi, Omar Khayam and Gafiz are reflected so distortedly in the form of Dante, Goethe and Pushkin. [It is curious that at the same time the author himself is lagging behind the development of Western thought.

In a somewhat simplified, but at the same time very vivid form, all these questions - both plans for the future of Russia and their national aspect - appear in the theory put forward by Yanov and expounded in a number of articles and in two books. In the classical spirit of "analyzing the alignment of class forces," he divides our society into two layers: the "establishment" and "dissidents." Each of them generates both "left" and "right" flow. The author places all his hopes on the "leftists". The "Establishment Left" (author's term) consists of the party "aristocracy" or "elite" and "cosmopolitan managers." It needs reconstruction and "modernization of their archaic ideology", and for this - in alliance with "the most brilliant minds of Russia,

However, this contradiction has gone so far that its resolution is impossible without an arbitrator, whose authority is recognized by both parties. The Western intellectual society can serve as such an arbiter. It can work out an accurate and detailed program to reconcile all the positive socio-political forces of the USSR - a program that will unite them for a new step forward ...

This is Yanov's secret, his basic concept. And to express it more clearly, the author proposes OCCUPATION as a model:

This is an enterprise of grandiose, one might say, historical complexity. However, it is essentially the same as that faced by General MacArthur's "brain trust" at the end of World War II [General Mark-Arthur was the commander-in-chief of the American occupation forces in Japan.].

Was it plausible that autocratic Japan could be transformed from a dangerous potential enemy to a friendly business partner without fundamentally reorganizing its internal structure? The same principle applies to Russia ...

The layer on which this "grandiose enterprise" will rely within the country, Yanov also characterizes very accurately, citing as an example the hero of a satirical story. We are talking about a parasite that has not retained almost any human traits (except for purely external ones), all of whose activities are aimed at ensuring that real life never breaks through the barrier of bureaucracy. Real life for him is trips to the West and the purchases he brings from there. His dream is to bring from America some kind of extraordinary "stereo toilet". "Suppose he wants a stereophonic toilet," argues Yanov, "is it plausible that he wants a world war?"

This picture cannot be denied courage: the spiritual (for now) occupation by the "Western intellectual society", which becomes our arbiter and teacher, relying within the country on the layer of "cosmopolitan managers" who are supplied in abundance with stereophonic toilets! It can be taken as a laconic and figurative summary of the ideology of the current we are considering.

§ 4. "LITTLE PEOPLE"

The views discussed in the previous two paragraphs merge into a single system. Moreover, it is based on a whole philosophy of history - a special view of the nature of the historical process. The question is whether history is an organic process, similar to the growth of a living organism or biological evolution, or whether it is consciously constructed by people, like some kind of mechanism. In other words, the question of what to consider society - an organism or a mechanism, living or dead.

According to the first point of view, human society has developed as a result of the evolution of "norms of behavior" (in the broadest sense: technological, social, cultural, moral, religious). These "norms of behavior", as a rule, were not deliberately invented by anyone, but arose as a result of a very complex process in which each new step was made on the basis of the entire previous history. The future is born by the past, History is not at all according to our intentions. Just as a new animal organ did not arise because the animal had previously understood its usefulness, so the new social institution was often not created consciously to achieve a specific goal.

The second point of view asserts that society is built by people logically, from considerations of expediency, on the basis of a decision made in advance. Here it is quite possible, and often necessary, to ignore the historical tendencies, the people's character, the system of values developed over the centuries. (Voltaire's statement is typical: "Do you want to have good laws? Burn your own and write new ones.") But the decisive role is played by those who have the necessary knowledge and skills: these are the true creators of History. They must first work out plans, and then adjust life to these plans. The entire nation is only material in their hands. Like a carpenter from wood or an engineer from reinforced concrete, they erect a new structure from this material, the scheme of which is previously developed. Obviously, with such a view, there is an abyss between the "material" and the "creators", "creators" cannot perceive "material" as the same people (this would prevent its processing), but they are quite capable of feeling antipathy and irritation towards it if it refuses to correctly understand its role. The choice of one or the other of these concepts forms people of two different psychological types. Having accepted the first point of view, a person feels himself to be an assistant and an employee of forces far superior to him. By accepting the second - an independent creator of history, a demiurge, a little god, and in the end - a rapist. It is on this path that a society deprived of freedom arises, no matter what democratic attributes such an ideology may be furnished with. if he refuses to understand his role correctly. The choice of one or the other of these concepts forms people of two different psychological types. Having accepted the first point of view, a person feels himself to be an assistant and an employee of forces far superior to him. By accepting the second - an independent creator of history, a demiurge, a little god, and in the end - a rapist. It is on this path that a society deprived of freedom arises, no matter what democratic attributes such an ideology may be furnished with. if he refuses to understand his role correctly. The choice of one or the other of these concepts forms people of two different psychological types. Having accepted the first point of view, a person feels himself to be an assistant and an employee of forces far superior to him. By accepting the second -

an independent creator of history, a demiurge, a little god, and in the end - a rapist. It is on this path that a society deprived of freedom arises, no matter what democratic attributes such an ideology may be furnished with.

The views that we have considered in the previous two paragraphs represent a consistent application of the second point of view (society as a mechanism) to the history of our country. Let us remember how much effort was expended to tarnish the history and the entire appearance of our people. It can be seen how irritated the authors fear that our future will be based on the historical traditions of this country. Almost foaming at the mouth, they prove to us that democracy of the Western type is absolutely alien to the spirit and history of our people - and just as temperamentally insist that we take this very state form. The project of spiritual occupation by the "Western intellectual community", developed by Yanov, is being embodied visually in the image of Russia - a car, on the seat of which a clever driver jumps up merrily, turns on the ignition - and the car rushes off. Typically, that our future is offered a choice of only two possibilities: "Western-style democracy" and "totalitarianism". Neither the growth of an organism, nor the behavior of an animal is ever based on a choice between two possibilities, but always among an infinite number of alternatives continuously passing into each other. On the other hand, an element of a computing machine must be designed in such a way that it can be in only two states: on and off.

And the necessary conclusion from this concept: the selection of the "creative elite" and the view of the whole people as a material for creativity - was very vividly reflected in our authors. Here are some examples of how they characterize the attitude of their circle towards the rest of the population. At the same time, we will encounter such difficulty: these authors characterize the circle with which they clearly identify themselves with various terms: intelligentsia (more often), dissidents (less often), elite, "the chosen people" ... I propose to temporarily completely ignore this terminology, but proceed from the fact that we have a layer that is not yet known to us, some of the features of which we want to restore. To the question of how this stratum is related to the intelligentsia, dissidents, etc., we will return later, when we imagine it more concretely.

So, this is how Gorsky understands the situation:

... the old contradiction between the "groundless intelligentsia" and the people appears today as a contradiction between the creative elite and the deceived and depraved masses, aggressive towards freedom and higher cultural values.

Moreover, at the same time:

It should also be noted that the new opposition intelligentsia, with all its isolation from the masses, nevertheless represents the masses that gave birth to it, is, as it were, an organ of their self-consciousness.

Shragin's point of view is:

In addition to a thin layer of European educated and democratically minded intelligentsia, the roots of the dissident movement have stumbled across the permafrost.

And what's more:

An intellectual in Russia is a sighted among the blind, responsible among the irresponsible, sane among the insane.

So, the "European educated and democratically minded intelligentsia" is ripe for the majority of the people to declare INAUTABLE! And where is the place for the insane, if not in a psychiatric hospital?

Finally, a look from Pomerantz:

"Religion has ceased to be a sign of the people. It has become a sign of the elite." "Something new will replace the people." "Here ... the backbone of a new people is being formed." "The masses can re-crystallize into something like people only around the new intelligentsia."

The concept of the elite, the "chosen people" for the author is an undisputable dogma, it is only discussed where to find the elite:

I rely on the intelligentsia not at all because they are good ... Intellectual development in itself only increases the capacity for evil ... My chosen people are bad, I know that ... but the rest are even worse.

Along the way, our authors must inevitably meet with an obvious logical difficulty, so you look forward to when they will run into it. After all, if the Russian consciousness is so imbued with servility, adoration of cruel power, the dream of the Master, if legal traditions are absolutely alien to us, then how can such a people be instilled with a democratic system by democratic methods, and even in the near future? But it turns out that there is no difficulty for the authors here either. It's just that then the Russians need to be made democratic, albeit undemocratic methods. (Rousseau called it: making you free.)

As Shragin writes:

Under despotism, not the majority decides. Of course, this is contrary to the ideals of democracy. But even the best of the ideals degenerates into utopia when it is too small to contain reality.

And this statement, so striking in its frankness, did not seem to provoke any reaction in the émigré press, which so emphasizes its democratic character in other cases!

Before us is a layer that is very clearly aware of its unity, especially clearly emphasized by the sharp opposition of itself to the rest of the people. Thinking in antitheses is typical for him:

the creative elite is a deceived and depraved mass,

the chosen people - philistinism,

European educated and democratically minded intelligentsia - permafrost,

sane - insane,

the tribe of giants is a human pigsty.

(The latter is from Semyon Telegin's samizdat article "How to be?") This stratum is united by the consciousness of its elitism, confidence in its right and ability to determine the fate of the country. Apparently, the existence of such a social stratum is the key to understanding the ideology that we are considering.

This social phenomenon would probably become clearer if it could be included in a broader historical framework. Indeed, in at least one historical situation, such a phenomenon was described in detail and vividly - during the era of the Great French Revolution.

One of the most interesting researchers of the French Revolution (both in the freshness of his ideas and in his amazing erudition), Augustin Koshen, in his works paid special attention to a certain social or spiritual layer, which he called the "Small People". In his opinion, the decisive role in the French Revolution was played by the circle of people formed in philosophical societies and academies, Masonic lodges, clubs and sections. The specificity of this circle was that it lived in its own intellectual and spiritual world: the "Small People" among the "Big People". One could say - the anti-people among the people, since the worldview of the first was built on the principle of the ADVERSION of the worldview of the second. It was here that the type of person necessary for the coup was developed, who was hostile and disgusting that which constituted the roots of the nation, its spiritual backbone: Catholic faith, noble honor, loyalty to the king, pride in its history, attachment to the peculiarities and privileges of its native province, its class or guild. Societies uniting representatives of the "Small People" created for their members a kind of artificial world, in which their entire life proceeded. If in the ordinary world everything is tested by experience (for example, historical), then the general opinion decides here. What others think is real, what they say is true, good is what they approve of. The usual order is reversed: doctrine becomes the cause and not the effect of life.

The mechanism of the formation of the "Small People" is what was then called "liberation from the dead weight", from people who were too subordinate to the laws of the "Old World": people of honor, deed, faith. For this, societies are continuously

performing "purifications" (corresponding to the "purges" of our era). As a result, an increasingly pure "Small People" is created, moving towards "freedom" in the sense of ever more liberation from the ideas of the "Big People": from such prejudices as religious or monarchical feelings, which can only be understood by experience of spiritual communication with them. Cochin illustrates this process with a beautiful example - the image of a "savage" so widespread in the literature of the Enlightenment: "Persian prince" Montesquieu, "Huron" Voltaire, "Tahitian" Diderot, etc. Usually this is a person who possesses all the material accessories and formal knowledge provided by civilization, but is absolutely devoid of understanding the spirit that revives all this, so everything in life shocks him, seems stupid and illogical. According to Koshen, this image is not an invention, it is taken from life, but these "savages" were found not in the forests of Ohio, but in philosophical academies and Masonic lodges: this is the image of the person they wanted to create, a paradoxical creature for whom the environment his habitat is emptiness just as for others - the real world. He sees everything and does not understand anything, and it was by the depth of misunderstanding that the abilities among these "savages" were measured. but absolutely devoid of understanding the spirit that revives all this, therefore everything in life shocks him, seems stupid and illogical. According to Koshen, this image is not an invention, it is taken from life, but these "savages" were found not in the forests of Ohio, but in philosophical academies and Masonic lodges: this is the image of the person they wanted to create, a paradoxical creature for whom the environment his habitat is emptiness just as for others - the real world. He sees everything and does not understand anything, and it was by the depth of misunderstanding that the abilities among these "savages" were measured. this is the image of the person they wanted to create, a paradoxical creature for whom emptiness is his habitat, just as for others - the real world. He sees everything and does not understand anything, and it was by the depth of misunderstanding that the abilities among these "savages" were measured. this is the image of the person they wanted to create, a paradoxical creature for whom emptiness is his habitat, just as for others - the real world. He sees everything and does not understand anything, and it was by the depth of misunderstanding that the abilities among these "savages" were measured.

A representative of the "Small People", if he has gone all the way of upbringing, expects a truly wonderful existence: all the difficulties, contradictions of real life for him disappear, and he seems to be freed from the chains of life, everything seems simple and understandable to him. But this has its downside: he can no longer live outside the "Small People", in the world of the "Big People" he suffocates like a fish pulled out of water. So the "Big People" becomes a threat to the existence of the "Small People", and their struggle begins: the Lilliputians try to bind Gulliver. This struggle, according to

Koshen, took the years leading up to the French Revolution and a revolutionary period. The years of the revolution 1789-1794 are the five years of the power of the "Small People" over the "Big People". Only the "Small People" called themselves a people, only formulated his rights in the "Declarations". This explains the paradoxical situation when the "victorious people" ended up in the minority, and the "enemies of the people" - in the majority (this statement was constantly in the language of the revolutionary leaders.)

We are faced with a worldview remarkably close to that which was the subject of our analysis in this work. This includes looking at one's own history as sheer savagery, rudeness, failure - all these "Henriads" and "Orleans Virgins". And the desire to break all their ties, even external ones, connecting with the historical tradition: renaming cities, changing the calendar. And the conviction that everything reasonable should be borrowed from outside, then from England; they are imbued with, for example, Voltaire's "Philosophical Letters" (sometimes called "Letters from England"). And in particular, copying someone else's political system - English parliamentarism.

It seems to me that this remarkable concept is applicable not only to the era of the French Revolution, it sheds light on a much wider range of historical phenomena. Apparently, in every crisis, turning point in the life of the people, the same "Small People" appears, all of whose life attitudes are OPPOSITE to the worldview of the rest of the people, for whom everything that organically grew over the centuries, all the roots of the spiritual life of the nation, its religion, the traditional state structure, moral principles, way of life - all this is hostile, it seems ridiculous and dirty prejudices that require uncompromising eradication. Cut off completely from the spiritual connection with the people, he looks at it only as a material, and at its processing - as a purely TECHNICAL problem, so that its solution is not limited by any moral standards, compassion or pity. This worldview, Koshen notes, is clearly expressed in the fundamental symbol of the Masonic movement that played such a role in the preparation of the revolution - in the image of the construction of the Temple, where individuals act as stones mechanically applied to each other according to the drawings of the "architects."

Now we will give several examples to confirm our guess that here we are really dealing with a general historical phenomenon.

1. Turning to the era preceding the one studied by Koshen, we are faced with CALVINISM, which, in the form of the Huguenot movement in France and the Puritans in England, had a great influence on the life of Europe in the 16th-17th centuries. In his ideology, especially among the Puritans, we easily recognize the familiar features of the "Small People". Calvin's teaching asserted that even before the creation of the world, God predestinated some people to salvation, others to eternal destruction. A person cannot influence this already made decision by any of his own affairs. Only a few are chosen: a tiny group of "saints" in sinful, suffering and doomed to eternal torment humanity. But even the "saints" cannot have any connection with God, "for the finite can

never touch the infinite." Their chosenness is manifested only in the fact that they become an instrument of God,

This amazing teaching, in fact a new religion, created in the "saints" a feeling of complete isolation, opposition to the rest of humanity. Their central experience was the feeling of being chosen; they even thanked God in prayer that they were not like the "rest of the mass." The idea of emigration played a colossal role in their worldview. Partly due to the fact that the beginning of the Puritan movement was laid by a group of Protestants who fled from persecution during the period of Catholic reaction under Mary Tudor: in a state of complete isolation, isolation from their homeland, under the influence of the teachings of Calvin, they laid the foundations of the theology and psychology of Puritanism. But partly also because, even after returning to England, in their views, they remained emigrants, strangers. The favorite image of their literature was the wanderer, the fugitive, the pilgrim.

The narrow communities of "saints" were constantly subjected to purifications, excommunication, sometimes covering the majority of communities. And the "doomed", according to the views of the Puritans, had to be subjected to the discipline of their church, and coercion was quite acceptable here. The gap between the "saints" and the "doomed" did not leave room for mercy or help to the sinner - only hatred for sin and its bearer remained. A special subject of denunciation and hatred of Puritan literature were the peasants, who lost their land and drove to the city in droves in search of work, and often turned into vagabonds. The Puritans demanded more and more stringent laws: they extolled flogging, branding with a red-hot iron. And most importantly, they demanded the protection of the "righteous" from contact with vagrant beggars.

Puritan literature sought to tear the "saints" away from historical traditions (which were the traditions of the "people of the world"), for the "saints" all established customs, laws, national, dynastic or class attachments were not valid. It was, in principle, a nihilistic ideology. Indeed, the Puritans also called for a complete remaking of the world, of all existing "laws, customs, statutes, ordinances and constitutions." Moreover, to rework according to a plan known to them in advance. The call to "build on a new foundation" was reinforced by the familiar image of "building the Temple" - this time the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple after the return of the Jews from captivity.

As Max Weber argues, the real role of Calvinism in economic life was to destroy the traditional economic system. In the English Revolution, his decisive role was that, relying on the Puritans and even more extreme sects, a new layer of the rich managed to overthrow the traditional monarchy, which had previously enjoyed the support of the majority of the people.

2. In the era following the French Revolution, a very similar phenomenon can be observed. So, in the 30s and 40s of the XIX century in Germany, all spiritual life was under the influence of philosophical and political radicalism: "Young Germany" and "Left Hegelianism". His goal was the destruction (as they said then "merciless criticism" or "revolution") all the foundations of the then German life: Christianity, philosophy, state,

society. Everything German was renamed "Teutonic" or "Prussian" and became the object of vilification and ridicule. We come across statements familiar to the reader that the Germans are devoid of self-esteem, that they are characterized by hatred of everything alien, that their history is a chain of meanness, that it is generally difficult to consider them human. After Goethe, Schiller,

German patriotism was identified with reactionaryism; on the contrary, they worshiped everything Western, especially French. The term "pro-French antipatriotism" was in use. It was hoped that the French would again occupy Germany and bring her freedom. Emigration to France was fashionable; 85,000 Germans lived in Paris. Heine was a typical representative of this trend. First, Christianity was the subject of his constant malicious, often dirty, and because of this, even ungodly attacks. For example, such an artistic image: "Some spiritual insects give off a stench when crushed. This is Christianity: this spiritual bug was crushed 1800 years ago (crucifixion of Christ?), And still poisons the air for us, poor Jews." And secondly, the German character, culture, history: so, at the end of the poem "Germany - A Winter's Tale" he compares the future of Germany to the stench of a chamber pot. And not because he was just such an acrimonious, skeptical person: he adored Napoleon to idolatry, worshiped everything French and even called himself "the leader of the French party in Germany."

3. In Russia in the second half of the 19th century, the same features are very clearly visible in the liberal and nihilistic trend. The well-known publicist of the sixties V. Zaitsev wrote about the Russians: "Leave all hope, slavery is in their blood." The same thought belongs to Zaitsev:

... They want to be democrats, and that's all, but there they don't care that there are only animals in human form to replace the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie ... The people are rude, stupid and, as a result, passive ... Therefore, prudence demands, not embarrassed by the majestic pedestal on which the democrats have erected the people, to act energetically against it.

As we can see, Shragin's idea that under despotism the minority should decide, and "the principles of democracy are too tight to contain reality," was expressed even then. Moreover, Dostoevsky says:

"The people will not allow this," one interlocutor said on one occasion, two years ago, to one ardent Westerner.

- "So destroy the people!" - answered the Westerner calmly and dignifiedly.

A remarkably contemptuous attitude towards their culture, the same as that of the German radicals of the 30s, combined with an admiration for Western culture and especially German. So, Chernyshevsky and Zaitsev declared Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol to be mediocre writers without their own thoughts, and Tkachev added Tolstoy to this list. Saltykov-Shchedrin, making fun of The Mighty Handful, depicted some kind of nugget (Mussorgsky?) Poking his fingers at the keys at random, and at the end of all

sits down all backwards on the keyboard. And these are not exceptional examples: that was the general style.

In the "Diary of a Writer" Dostoevsky constantly argues with some very definite, clear ideology. And when you read him, it seems that he means exactly the literature that we are analyzing in this work: this is how everything coincides. There is also an assertion about the slavish soul of the Russian peasant, that he loves the rod, that "the history of our people is absurd" and as a consequence - "It is necessary that a people like ours has no history, but what the sight of history must have been forgotten by him with disgust, the whole thing. " And the goal is to ensure that the people "... will be ashamed of their past and curse it. Whoever curses his past is already ours — this is our formula!" And the principle is that "apart from the European truth, there is no other and cannot be." And even the statement that "... in essence, there are no people either,

Really, here too, they will not allow and will not allow the Russian body to develop nationally, by its organic strength, and certainly impersonally, servilely imitating Europe? But what to do with the Russian organism then? Do these gentlemen understand what an organism is?

He makes a terrible assumption: that the separation, "split off" from their country leads to hatred, that these people HATE Russia.

so to speak, naturally, physically: for the climate, for the fields, for the forests, for the order, for the liberation of the peasant, for the Russian history, in a word, for everything, for everything they hate.

L. Tikhomirov, who traveled the path of a terrorist up to one of the leaders of Narodnaya Volya, and then departed from this trend, paints a very similar picture in his later works. According to him, the worldview of those youth circles from which the terrorists emerged was based on a break with the past culture. The overthrow of all authorities and adherence only to "one's own reason" was proclaimed, which, on the contrary, led to the domination of the lowest and most primitive authorities. The significance of materialism and anti-nationalism rose to a religious level, and the epithet "renegade" was boastful. The ideas of these circles were so limited that young people appeared who asserted that nothing should be read at all - they were called "troglodytes". Indeed, they could borrow in the literature offered to them only confirmation of ideas already known to them in advance. As a result, a spiritual emptiness and melancholy developed. There were many cases of suicide, "they felt that they were facing darkness." They were ready to rush anywhere - and rushed into terror:

Do not expect any concessions from them either to common sense, or to human feeling, or to history. It was indignation against real life in the name of the absolute ideal. He cannot calm down, because if his ideal is impossible, then, consequently, there is nothing in the world, because of which it would be worth living. He would rather destroy "all evil", that is, all the world, everything that exposes him to a chimera, than give in.

Such a repetition over 400 years and in different European countries of such a clear set of ideas cannot be accidental - obviously, we are dealing with some very specific social phenomenon that always arises in a stable, standard form. It is hoped that this observation will help us understand the contemporary problem to which this work is devoted. The last centuries have greatly narrowed the range of those concepts that we are able to use when discussing historical and social issues. We easily recognize the role of economic factors or political interests in the life of society, we cannot but recognize (albeit with some bewilderment) the role of interethnic relations, we agree, at worst, not to ignore the role of religion - but mainly as a political factor, for example, when religious discord manifests itself in civil wars. In fact, apparently, much more powerful forces of a spiritual nature operate in history - but we are not even capable of discussing them, our "scientific" language does not grasp them. Namely, it depends on them - whether life is attractive to people, whether a person can find his place in it, it is they who give people strength (or deprive them). It is from the interaction of such spiritual factors that, in particular, this mysterious phenomenon is born: "The Small People".

§ 5. MODERN OPTION OF THE "LITTLE PEOPLE"

What reasons are there to believe that the same phenomenon of the "Small People" is manifested in our country? First of all, of course, is the literature that we are analyzing. It presents the entire standard set of ideas of the "Small People": the belief that the future of the people can, as a mechanism, be freely designed and rebuilt; in this regard, a contemptuous attitude towards the history of the "Big People", up to the assertion that it did not exist at all; the requirement to borrow in the future the basic forms of life from outside, and to break with its historical tradition; division of the people into "elite" and "inert mass" and firm belief in the right of the former to use the latter as material for historical creativity; finally, a direct disgust for the representatives of the "Big People", their psychological makeup. And these features are expressed in our contemporary "Small People" no less vividly than in its previous versions. For example, nowhere before has there been such a vivid symbol of the domination of the "Small People" over the "Big People" as the model of occupation proposed by Yanov. And the subtle image of Pomeranz:

... the place of the intelligentsia is always half way ... Spiritually, all modern intellectuals belong to the diaspora. We are not completely strangers everywhere. We are everywhere not quite our own ...

perfectly conveys the attitude of "people without roots" who make up the "Small People".

Often sayings from the literature of the modern "Small People" coincide so much with the thoughts of their predecessors that it seems as if some are being quoted by others. This is especially striking when comparing the modern "Small People" with its predecessor 100-120 years ago, which took shape within the liberal, nihilistic, terrorist and revolutionary movement in our country. After all, this is really strange: in the literature of the modern "Small People" one can find thoughts - almost quotations from Zaitsev, Chernyshevsky or Trotsky, although at the same time its representatives act as convinced Westernizers-democrats who completely reject the ideals and practices of the "revolutionary age" of Russian history, referring all this to the tradition of "Russian totalitarianism".

Thus, Zaitsev and Shragin, separated from each other by a century, completely unanimously admit that with regard to the entire people, the framework of democracy is "too narrow." "Slavery is in their blood," says Zaitsev, and Pomerantz repeats: "A Kholui mixture of anger, envy and admiration for power."

And if the widow of the poet O. Mandelstam N. Ya. Mandelstam in her memoirs, condemning those who leave the struggle for spiritual freedom, wrote: "You cannot get drunk until you feel insensible (...) You cannot collect icons and pickle cabbage", and Trotsky (in "Literature and Revolution") called the peasant poets (Yesenin, Klyuev, etc.) "muzhik", said that their nationalism is "primitive and gives off like cockroaches", then in both cases the same mood is expressed. When Pomerantz writes:

The intelligentsia is a measure of social forces — progressive, reactionary. Opposed to the intelligentsia, the whole people merges into a reactionary mass,

then this is almost a repetition (interestingly, conscious or involuntary?) of the provisions of the famous Gotha program:

In relation to the proletariat, all other classes merge into one reactionary mass.

Obviously, this is not only a coincidence of individual turns of thought. After all, if we squeeze out the main nucleus of the literature of the modern "Small People", try to reduce its ideas to several thoughts, then we will get such a familiar concept of the "accursed past", Russia - "the prison of peoples"; the assertion that all our today's troubles are explained by "vestiges", "birthmarks" - true, not capitalism, but "Russian messianism" or "Russian despotism", even "the devil of Russian tyranny." But "great-power chauvinism" as the main danger is literally preserved, as if borrowed by the literature of the "Small People" from the reports of Stalin and Zinoviev.

Here's another concrete confirmation. Shragin declares that he does not agree that the consciousness of our people has been crippled by processing, the purpose of which was to make us feel ashamed of our history, to forget about its existence, when Russia was presented as a "gendarme of Europe" and a "prison of peoples", and its history boiled down to the fact that "they beat her continuously." [Although, it would seem, what kind of gendarme is this, if they only do what they beat? Apparently, this was expressed by the desire to hurt Russia with two arguments at once, although contradictory to each other.]

The time when this was done is forgotten by everyone, he says.

Someone would try to push through the modern Soviet censorship these words - "gendarme of Europe", referring them at least to the Russian past.

But he himself writes on the same page:

Was Russia a "gendarme of Europe"? - Is not it so? Was it a "prison of the peoples" - who has the conscience to deny it? Was she constantly beaten for her backwardness and harshness? - Fact.

This means that "the time when this was done" is not at all forgotten, first of all, by Shragin himself. Only the soloist has changed - before us is like a well-rehearsed orchestra, in which the melody, as it develops, passes from one instrument to another. And at the same time, they paint a picture of two antagonists, two paths that fundamentally exclude each other. And we see only a choice between these paths, for there is no third, as we are assured. Again the same, familiar situation!

Never, in any incarnation of the "Small People", such a complete conviction in its ability and right to determine the life of the "Big People" has not stopped at a purely literary

level. For example, Amalrik already compares the current emigration with the "emigration of hope" that preceded 1917. And of course, there is no doubt that in the event of any crisis, they will be here again in the role of ideological leaders who have suffered their right to leadership in the throes of expulsion. It is not for nothing that the legend is so stubbornly supported that they were all "expelled" or "expelled", although they spent a long time pushing the OVIR's doorsteps, seeking their visas.

Another indication of the presence of a certain stratum imbued with elite, circle feelings, not seeking to get in touch with the main social strata of the population, even repelling them, can, it seems to me, be drawn from observation of our social life, from various speeches, statements, etc. e. I mean that their amazing feature is that very often they are aimed at the problems of the MINORITY. So, the issue of going abroad, which is relevant only for hundreds of thousands of people, has caused an incredible intensity of passions on an American or Israeli challenge to emigrate?). In the national area, the fate of the Crimean Tatars attracts much more attention than the fate of the Ukrainians, and the fate of the Ukrainians is greater than that of the Russians. If it is reported about the oppression of believers, then much more is said about representatives of relatively small religious movements (Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Pentecostals) than Orthodox or Muslims. When it comes to the situation of prisoners, it is almost exclusively political prisoners, although they hardly make up more than 1% of the total. You might think that the situation of the minority is actually more difficult. This is completely wrong: the problem of the majority of the people is no less acute, but, of course, one should be interested in them; if you ignore them, then they, as it were, will not be. And, perhaps, the most striking example is the statement made several years ago by a foreign correspondent that children of the intelligentsia are prevented from obtaining a higher education (it was broadcast on several radio stations). While, as for the children of the intelligentsia, especially in large cities, the possibility of entering a higher school, on the contrary, is greater than for the rest: because of the attitude instilled in the family that a higher education must be obtained, because of the greater culture of the family, which compensates for the insufficient level of secondary school, because of the opportunity to hire tutors. What a shame such a statement would have been in the eyes of the intelligentsia of the last century, who considered themselves indebted to the people! Now the task is to snatch a place for their children at the expense of the people. What a shame such a statement would have been in the eyes of the intelligentsia of the last century, who considered themselves indebted to the people! Now the task is to snatch a place for their children at the expense of the people.

Another sign pointing in the same direction is the "cult of emigration". The attention paid to freedom of emigration, the explanation of the right to emigrate as "the first among equal" human rights cannot be explained simply by the fact that the protesters want to leave themselves. In some cases, this is not the case. Here emigration is perceived as a kind of principle, a philosophy of life. First of all, as a demonstration that "it is impossible for a decent person to live in this country." But more than that, as a model of

attitudes towards local life, disgust, isolation and separation from it. (Even Dostoevsky, concerning Herzen, noted that there are people who were born as emigrants, who are able to live like this all their lives, even never having gone abroad.) How delicate and painful this topic is, are shown by the following two examples. 1) At one press conference, the idea was expressed that emigration is not a feat after all, but people who have broken spiritual ties with their homeland are leaving, who are therefore hardly capable of making a great contribution to its culture. Denials and protests poured in the Western and emigre press, on the radio ... One writer living here wrote a huge article in the French left-wing newspaper *Le Monde*, in which, in particular, he argued that "breaking away from the homeland" is always a feat and that "we (?) who remained have blessed those who have left." 2) The magazine "Continent", published in Paris in Russian, in its first issue, where the program of the magazine is proposed and its intention to speak on behalf of the "Continent of Eastern Europe" is proclaimed, publishes an article by one of its organizers and influential member of the editorial board, A. Sinyavsky [A. D. Sinyavsky in the 60s published in the West under the pseudonym Abram Tertz several short stories and novellas. He was tried and sentenced to 7 years. After serving 4 years, he was amnestied and emigrated. In Paris, he was one of the organizers of the Continent magazine. He published several books, of which "Walks with Pushkin", had the success of a scandal (typical review: "Walks with Pushkin"). Now he publishes the Syntax magazine in Paris.] (Under the pseudonym Abram Tertz). "The third emigration is now on the agenda," the author writes. He understands it broadly. "But everyone runs and runs" - not only people, for example, emigration coincides with the fact that "manuscripts are leaving and leaving Russia." And the article ends with a picture: Sinyavsky in the 60s published in the West under the pseudonym Abram Tertz several short stories and novellas. He was tried and sentenced to 7 years. After serving 4 years, he was amnestied and emigrated. In Paris, he was one of the organizers of the Continent magazine. He published several books, of which "Walks with Pushkin", had the success of a scandal (typical review: "Walks with Pushkin"). Now he publishes the Syntax magazine in Paris.] (Under the pseudonym Abram Tertz). "The third emigration is now on the agenda," the author writes. He understands it broadly. "But everyone runs and runs" - not only people, for example, emigration coincides with the fact that "manuscripts are leaving and leaving Russia." And the article ends with a picture: In Paris, he was one of the organizers of the Continent magazine. He published several books, of which "Walks with Pushkin", had the success of a scandal (typical review: "Walks with Pushkin"). Now he publishes the Syntax magazine in Paris.] (Under the pseudonym Abram Tertz). "The third emigration is now on the agenda," the author writes. He understands it broadly. "But

everyone runs and runs" - not only people, for example, emigration coincides with the fact that "manuscripts are leaving and leaving Russia." And the article ends with a picture: In Paris, he was one of the organizers of the Continent magazine. He published several books, of which "Walks with Pushkin", had the success of a scandal (typical review: "Walks with Pushkin"). Now he publishes the Syntax magazine in Paris.] (Under the pseudonym Abram Tertz). "The third emigration is now on the agenda," the author writes. He understands it broadly. "But everyone runs and runs" - not only people, for example, emigration coincides with the fact that "manuscripts are leaving and leaving Russia." And the article ends with a picture:

When we were leaving, and we were doing it on the sly, together with the Jews, I saw books bouncing on the plank floor of the truck towards customs. Books jumped in a bundle like frogs, and titles flashed: "Poets of the Renaissance", "Saltykov-Shchedrin". By that time, I had already shaken everything off myself. But they jumped and jumped. (...) Books were also leaving ...

I was just glad, looking at the packs of brown books, that Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin himself was leaving with mine, his ears tucked in.

We were leaving for good. It was all over and forgotten. (...) Dahl was open to our adventures. And the books were jumping. And himself, in person, with his ears tucked in, Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin flew away.

This is some kind of anthem of emigration, the apotheosis of flight: the author himself "shook everything away from himself," for him "everything was over and forgotten", but this is not enough - not only people are running, but also manuscripts, books, and even great Russians are "running away" writers - Russian Literature.

And we can observe the same psychology of the "Small People" in our life all the time. Popular singers, famous storytellers - from tape recorders, televisions, from the stage stage - hammer into their heads the image of a Russian - an alcoholic, a bastard, "cattle with a human face." In a fashionable theater with a reputation for liberalism, there is a play from the Russian past. The understanding public subtly exchanges glances: "How boldly, how keenly noticed, how it hints at the present: indeed, it has always been this way in this country and it cannot be otherwise." In cinema, we see films in which our past is presented either as a hopeless darkness and horror, or as a booth and operetta. And at every step you can come across this ideology. For example, in this rhyme, in four lines setting out the whole concept of the revolution:

What a pity that Marx's legacy
fell into the Russian font,
Where the end justifies the means,
And the means about ... whether the end.

Or in a funny joke about how two worms - a newborn and his mother - crawled out of a dung heap into the world. The newborn liked the grass and the sun so much that he

says: "Mom, why are we swarming in manure? Let's crawl there!" - "Shh," my mother replies, "this is our Motherland!" Such anecdotes themselves will not be born, someone invents them for some reason!

The above arguments lead to the conclusion:

the literary trend considered in this work is a manifestation of the ideology of the "Small People", a reflection of his war with the "Big People".

This point of view explains all those features of this literature that we have noted throughout our work: antipathy towards Russia ("the Big People"), Russian history; the irritation that causes any attempt to look at life from the Russian national point of view; insistence on ideologically breaking with our past and constructing the future without referring to our historical experience. Here the image of Koshen turns out to be especially pertinent: Lilliputians crawl on the bound Gulliver, showering him with poisoned arrows ...

This conclusion, however, immediately gives rise to another question: who does this "Small People" consist of, in what strata of our society does it live? In this section, we will do only preparatory work, having considered the terms used by the ideologues of the "Small People" themselves when they talk about the social strata with which they identify themselves. There are two such terms, at least somewhat specific: "intelligentsia" and "dissident movement."

Undoubtedly, the authors of the works we have examined are people of "writing" and therefore refer to the intelligentsia in any sense of the word. Likewise, those they turn to are samizdat readers or people who can get hold of Russian magazines coming out in the West, and probably also belong to the intelligentsia. Therefore, it is plausible that our "Small People" makes up some part of the intelligentsia. However, there is no reason to identify him with the entire class of "educated people", for example, "persons with higher education". The life views of millions of teachers, doctors, engineers, agronomists, etc. are completely different. But, unfortunately, we inherited from the 19th century the bad habit of considering the intelligentsia only as a whole. An example of such a global judgment was the concept of "intelligentsia, of conservative convictions was not even elected to the Academy of Sciences). But they wrote for someone, had their readers and listeners - wouldn't it turn out that the majority of the intelligentsia does not belong to it? In Russian journalism, the term "order" was often applied to the intelligentsia (P. Annensky, F. Stepun, N. Zernov). For example, Annensky wrote: of conservative convictions was not even elected to the Academy of Sciences). But they wrote for someone, had their readers and listeners - wouldn't it turn out that the majority of the intelligentsia does not belong to it? In Russian journalism, the term "order" was often applied to the intelligentsia (P. Annensky, F. Stepun, N. Zernov). For example, Annensky wrote:

The intelligentsia is, as it were, a warring order that does not have any written charter, but knows all its members scattered across our land, and which, by some agreement, has always stood across the entire course of modern life.

It would be very strange to apply this image to zemstvo doctors, gymnasium teachers or engineers. Is it not natural to assume that the authors had in mind some very specific circle within the educated part of society, very reminiscent of the "Small People"? It is interesting to see how this issue is treated in the well-known collection Vekhi, subtitled Collection of Articles on the Russian Intelligentsia. P. Struve makes a reservation that he does not mean the entire intelligentsia, but a certain part of it, which is characterized by "irreligious split-off from the state" - a feature that is very suitable for the characterization of the "Small People". Berdyaev at the beginning of the article mentions that he means the "circle intelligentsia", and even suggests a new term for it: "intelligentsia". He says: "

The collection Vekhi provoked a violent reaction from the liberal part of the intelligentsia. As a response, the collection "Intelligentsia in Russia" appeared, in which prominent representatives of this trend took part: Kovalevsky, Milyukov, Tugan-Baranovsky, etc. How do they interpret the term "intelligentsia"? Miliukov considers the "intelligentsia" to be the nucleus of the "educated class", "it belongs to it the initiative and creativity." Describing it, he writes: "The Russian intelligentsia was anti-government almost from its very inception," it "developed its own patriotism of the state within the state," a special camp surrounded by enemies. He notes the "emigre mood" of the intelligentsia. Ovsyannikov-Kulikovsky writes about a common intellectual: "

It would seem that these features highlight some very narrow, specific layer or current. But sometimes the authors quite definitely refer them to the entire "educated society". Question: "Who is this - the intelligentsia?" - somehow manages, there is no definite point of view on him. It is evident that the authors of the collection had before them a very difficult social phenomenon to define. They vaguely felt its uniqueness, but did not even set the task of characterizing it more accurately. Then this feeling also disappeared: an amorphous, undifferentiated concept of "intelligentsia" took root, very distortedly reflecting a difficult life situation. This stamp, unfortunately, has survived, has survived to this day and prevents us from correctly assessing our reality. In particular, it must be admitted that the term "intelligentsia" gives a completely wrong interpretation of the "Small People" of interest to us. But it should be remembered that this term is nevertheless widely used in the literature of the "Small People" itself, and, meeting in the analyzed literature with the term "intelligentsia", we can understand it as "Small People".

Shragin and Yanov (and it seems that only they) sometimes use the term "dissidents" to designate the trend with which they identify themselves. This term is even less definite than "intelligentsia". And it was put into use by foreign correspondents who know very little about our life. But with any understanding of it, neither Yanov nor Shragin can be called dissidents: while they lived here, they were typical "workers in the ideological

sector." Also not dissidents are the four anonymous (and still not manifested) authors in No. 97 of Vestnik RSKhD, and even more so R. Pipes.

Other terms used, for example, by Pomerantz: "elite", "chosen people" - are even more vague. So, it seems to me that the terminology used by the ideologists of the "Small People" themselves does not make it possible to localize this "people" with any precision. We must look for some other ways to solve this problem.

§ 6. NATIONAL ASPECT

The direction in which this solution should be sought can be indicated by one very clearly noticeable feature of the literature being analyzed: its saturation with national and especially anti-Russian emotions. The authors, apparently acting as objective researchers looking for the truth, thinkers - historians, philosophers or sociologists - often do not keep their line and break into purely emotional, in no way logical attacks not only against Russian history, but against Russians in general. Perhaps the reader has already noted this feature of the above quotations ("universal Russian arrogance", "the lack of self-esteem among Russians", "a lackey mixture of anger and envy", "an archetypal Russian psychological predisposition to unanimous obedience", "the Russian soul reveled in cruelty authorities").

Here are some more examples that could be combined with the heading THEY ABOUT US:

Russia has brought more Evil into the world than any other country (NN).

The age-old stench of desolation in the place of the saint, dressed in the messianic "chosenness", the centuries-old pride of the "Russian idea" (aka).

"The people" turned out to be an imaginary size, suitable today only for myth-making ("Gorsky").

Their own national culture is completely alien to the Russian people (he is).

... Byzantine and Tatar imperfections (about Russian pre-Petrine times) (Pomerants).

(In Russia) Christian depths are almost always intertwined with abysses of moral abomination (he is.)

A country that for centuries swells and spreads like sour dough and sees no other tasks before itself (Amalrik).

A country without faith, without traditions, without culture (aka).

And what the Russians themselves in this country are the worst of all is logical and fair (Shragin).

(In pre-revolutionary Russia) the "working masses" are imbued with an acquisitive spirit of the worst bourgeois style combined with moral cynicism and political reactionariness (Pipes).

... the fulfillment of the dream of "order" and "Boss", which is already worrying the people's minds (Yanov).

... the traditional devotion of the people to the "Boss" (aka).

(The mixing of the population in the USSR is good because) "the Russophiles are knocking the ground out from under their feet." It is proposed to abandon the words "Russia", "Russian people", replacing them with "Soviet people, Soviet people, etc." (Belotserkovsky) [V. Belotserkovsky is a recent emigrant, a member of the collection "Democratic Alternatives" and an author of publicistic works. He lives in the Federal Republic of Germany, initiated proceedings against several other publicists on charges of anti-Semitism (there is a corresponding law in the Federal Republic of Germany), but did not win them.]

In general, in the literature of this trend, of all peoples, claims are made only to the Russian. For example, "nationalism" without any reservations implies Russian (see at least the collection of quotes "The Spectrum of Neonationalism in" Democratic Alternatives "). And at the same time Ivy also declares: "It seems to me nemoral to calculate who, by what percentage, has done dirty tricks on Russians in a thousand years ", - this is in the collection "Democratic Alternatives ", where such "calculations" and reproaches are addressed only to Russians!

In order not to create the impression that the word plays a special role here, we will give two examples where the same feelings are conveyed by means of painting.

1. On the cover of the magazine "The Third Wave" (6, 1979), published by A. Glezer, a reproduction of a painting by the artist Vlad. Ovchinnikov: a hut and a peasant are depicted against the background of a cemetery covered with crosses. The painting is called: DOG CEMETERY.

2. The luxuriously published catalog entitled "Contemporary Russian Painting" reproduces the painting by Alexander Zlotnik "Heavy Sky". In the picture, some creature without a head, standing, legs apart, gives birth to a monster with three dog's heads. From the first creature, urine flows, a whole lake of urine, giving birth to a river that flows like into a chamber pot - into the Cathedral of St. Basil the Blessed.

The peasants are especially disgusted by these authors. We have already mentioned the opinion of R. Pipes about the proverbs of Russian peasants, the meaning of which, in his opinion, is "primitively simple: take care only of yourself and not think about others." About their religion Meerson-Aksenov [M. G. Meerson-Aksenov. A historian by education. He published several works in Samizdat and in the West (partly under a pseudonym). Emigrated and graduated from a seminary in the United States. Ordained to the priesthood of the American Orthodox Church.] Says:

... the magic and superstition of peasant Orthodoxy. (And this is written by a person ordained as an Orthodox priest!)

Pomerantz's judgments are as follows:

A peasant cannot be reborn except as an opera one. Peasant nations are hungry nations, and nations in which the peasantry has disappeared (sic!) Are nations in which hunger has disappeared.

The peasants are not as perfect in religion as they are in agronomy.

And Amalric writes:

And if the language is the most complete expression of the national spirit, then who is more Russian - "little arap" Pushkin and "Jew" Mandelstam or a man who at the pub, smearing snot on unshaven cheeks, mumbles: "I am ... Russian!" [I apologize for the omission in the quote, but somehow the dirty curse used by the author does not fit.]

This list could be continued and continued ... [It is precisely these emotions, and not elementary illiteracy that should probably explain those gross logical and factual errors to which we drew attention in § 2. It is not plausible, for example, that Yanov believed that Belinsky is a "classic of Slavophilism". Most likely this is a manifestation of disgusting repulsion, when both the Slavophiles and the Westernizers are equally disgusting.] Feelings that drive the authors can hardly be otherwise characterized as RUSOPHOBIA (and both meanings put into the term "phobia" - fear and hatred are quite suitable). And hatred of one nation is most likely associated with a heightened feeling of belonging to another. Does this not make it plausible that the authors are under the influence of some powerful force, rooted in their national feelings? I propose to accept such a thesis as a working hypothesis and see if it helps to understand the whole phenomenon.

If, having accepted this "working hypothesis", we ask WHOSE national feelings are manifested here? - then for a person who knows the life of our country, the answer, I think, will not raise doubts. There is only one nation whose concerns we hear almost every day. Jewish national emotions are fevering both our country and the whole world: they influence disarmament negotiations, trade agreements and international relations of scientists, provoke demonstrations and sit-ins and surface in almost every conversation. The "Jewish question" acquired an incomprehensible power over the minds, overshadowed the problems of Ukrainians, Estonians, Armenians or Crimean Tatars. And the existence of the "Russian question", apparently, is not recognized at all.

The fact that the authors we are considering are often influenced by strong Jewish national feelings is confirmed by many features of this literature. For example, the place occupied in it by issues of concern to the Jewish nationalist movement: the problem of departure and the fear of anti-Semitism - they emerge in almost every work. Another feature is even more universal and characteristic. The works under consideration could create the impression that the national aspect of life in general is alien to their authors and even antipathetic. But here's what is striking: although the authors are mostly Jews, they NEVER try to try on their people and HIS state the reproaches they address to Russians and Russia. For example, almost all authors accuse Russians of "messianism", of pride of "chosenness". Whether the Russians have such traits and

how strongly they manifested themselves is a moot point. But "messiah" is not a Russian word! Berdyaev said that any messianism is only an imitation of the Jewish one. It is among the Jews that the idea of themselves as the "Chosen People" and the expectation of the Messiah constitute the undoubted basis of their religion, and religion is the basis of the state of Israel, and none of the authors sees anything painful or unnatural in IT.

These aspects stand out most clearly in the works of Yanov (that Yanov is a Jew, Breslauer emphasizes in the preface to one of his books, considering this a very important feature for characterizing Yanov). He very sincerely describes his confusion and bewilderment when, in the 60s, "new and strange times" came in the USSR: instead of resting in the sanatoriums of the Crimea and the Caucasus, intellectuals began to wander through the villages, collecting icons and even expressing concern about that the peasant population is disappearing! How he strove to convince all "honest and thinking people" that, inclining towards Russian nationalism, they are embarking on a dangerous and dark path! But, apparently, it did not seem strange to him that his fellow tribesmen at the same time did not go to a close village, but to a distant tropical country - not on vacation, but forever - and they were attracted not by the icons, which their fathers and grandfathers prayed to, but by the Temple, destroyed almost 2000 years ago! Or here Yanov describes a Russian national group that proclaimed in its program the inviolability of individual freedom, freedom of all methods of spreading the truth, demonstrations and meetings, etc. Nevertheless, Yanov believes that this is the beginning of a path that will inevitably lead to despotism only because that they spoke about the spiritual rebirth and the Russian way, using the expression "Great Russia", and proposed to ensure the special role of Orthodoxy in the future Russia. But all these features - and not in the form of dreams of 30 young people, but in reality - can be observed in the state of Israel! Does Yanov consider that it will inevitably follow the path of despotism? However, Israel is mentioned in his books only once - and as an example of a democratic state. Yanov believes that the traditional way of thinking of Russians is to ask "who is to blame for this?" (The conclusion is not absolutely convincing - after all, there is often a tendency to repentance, typical of Russians, expressed in the types of "repentant nobleman" and "repentant intellectual", in the help of Russians to the Polish uprising of 1863, etc.) On the other hand, in his books and articles, the concept of "anti-Semitism" plays an extremely important role. But the content of this concept is best expressed by its term: "the presumption of national innocence", the question "who is to blame?" in the misadventures of the Jews and the answer - everyone else, from the inhabitants of ancient Elephantine or ancient Alexandria to modern Russians. And Yanov does not see any parallels here! Some arguments are such that they only make sense at all if they are addressed to people of the same views, who look at all issues from the point of view of Jewish nationalism. So, Yanov cites as a document that should show the negative features of Russian nationalism, a letter circulated among the apparatus of a Western radio station. The author of the letter claims that the majority of the Russian editorial staff are Jews, pursuing a Russophobic policy. (Yanov borrows this data from an article by Belotserkovsky - the very one who wanted to "knock the ground out from under the feet of the Russophiles." He does not report anything about the content of this article.) But

what reprehensible can an impartial reader see in this? Yanov himself considers the introduction of moral assessments into politics as the main evil; he recognizes as democrats only those who fight for their rights "in the economic and political spheres." So the Russians are fighting for their rights in the Russian edition! After all, the recent reproach of the Jewish Anti-Defamation League that the percentage of Jews employed in the American banking business was not high enough did not cause outrage! With indignation, Yanov notes that the author does not stop at "researching blood (ie, racial origin)", apparently believing that it is inadmissible to talk about it. (Although why not? In an "open society", the strength of which, as we are assured, is that everything is discussed, nothing is hushed up?) But then Yanov proves,

Only the assumption of a nationalist-Jewish background can explain the mystery of the publication of Yanov's article about the Slavophiles - in Tel Aviv! Alas, very few people in Moscow are interested in Slavophiles, who cares about them in Tel Aviv? But from the proposed point of view, the situation becomes clear. The author wants to say: "Do not trust the freedom-loving, spiritual image that the Russian national movement has! In the end it will lead to harmful results for us. It was so before, it will always be so." Indeed, the motive of "anti-Semitism" appears on the last page of the article.

Finally, the ideologists of the "Small People" themselves often make statements that, if we use the translation known to us: "intelligentsia" - "Small People", acquire the meaning of proclaiming a special, central role that its Jewish core plays in our contemporary "Small People" ... So N. Ya. Mandelstam (the poet's widow) writes:

Jews and half-breeds of today are the newly born intelligentsia.

All destinies in our age are multifaceted, and it occurs to me that every real intellectual is always a little Jew ...

The idea, apparently, is not accidental, since we find it in other authors as well. For example, Boris Khazanov (a pseudonym, the author says that he lives here), says:

This is the situation of Russian Jewry as it seems to me. I do not see a contradiction between my "blood" and what I speak Russian: between the fact that I am a Jew and the fact that I am a Russian intellectual. On the contrary, I find this combination to be natural. I am convinced that being a Russian intellectual now inevitably means being a Jew.

The author does not accept emigration as a way out (at least for himself). However, he states:

... I solemnly put an end to the theory of assimilation, to the philosophy of assimilationism. (...) I accept as something legitimate that I am a stranger here, and this is my liberation. (...) I do not recognize myself as a prodigal son, for whom it is time to return to my father's roof, my homeland is always with me, wherever I wander, I do not need to recognize myself as a Jew, and so I am a Jew from head to toe. You say, what

about the soil? How can you live with an abyss under your feet? But the lot of Russian Jews is to walk on water.

Declaring that he is not going to leave, the author says:

Patriotism in the Russian sense of the word is alien to me. The Russia that I love is a Platonic idea, it does not exist in nature. Russia I

I see around me, I'm disgusting. [These are not empty words - his book is saturated with disgust for Russia and Russians, spilling over on almost every page.]

At the same time, the author undertakes to indicate a certain mission, a special role of Russian Jewry (or at least some part of it):

Replacing the vacuum formed after the disappearance (!) Of the Russian intelligentsia, the Jews themselves became this intelligentsia. At the same time, however, they remained Jews. Therefore, they are given to experience the situation from the inside and at the same time see it from the outside. Russian people are deprived of this advantage - as they have repeatedly proved.

Likewise, Shragin emphasizes the national coloring of the understanding of the intelligentsia ("Small People"):

The national warehouse of the Russian intellectual has little in common with the national warehouse of the peasant, worker, or bureaucrat. ... Even Gershenzon noticed that the Russian intellectual is even an anthropologically different type than a man of the people.

Yes, and Yanov, setting out his project for the spiritual occupation and transformation of Russia by the "Western intellectual society", does not forget to add that to implement this grandiose plan, "New Baruch or Marshall" will be needed.

Particularly instructive to me is the thought expressed by Pomerantz:

Even Israel, I would like to see not a purely Jewish state, but a refuge for every "displaced person", for every person who has lost their homeland, the center of the diaspora universe (which is growing and expanding). If the Jewish people, after three thousand years of history, have a role to play, it's more in this than in simply surviving and being like everyone else.

It would be interesting to understand what these "displaced persons" are? Probably, this image is not used literally, for example, these are not Arab refugees from Palestine. Rather, it means people who have lost their soil, by analogy with those who have lost their homeland. The image of Israel as the capital or the Vatican, uniting the international diaspora of people without "roots" who have lost their soil and homeland, fully corresponds to the concept of the "Small People", which in our era is under the dominant influence of one of the currents of Jewish nationalism.

Obviously, Jewish national feelings are one of the main forces driving the "Small People" now. So, maybe we are dealing with a purely national trend? It seems that this is not so - the matter is more complicated. The psychology of the "Small People", when a crystal clear concept removes from a person the burden of choice, personal responsibility to the "Big People" and gives a sweet sense of belonging to the elite, such a psychology is not directly related to any social or national group. However, the "Small People" "incarnate": they use a certain group or layer, which at the moment has a tendency towards spiritual self-isolation, opposing itself to the "Big People". It can be a religious group (in England - Puritans), social (in France - III estate), national (we have a certain course of Jewish nationalism). But, as in France, priests and nobles played a prominent role in the revolution, so here you can find many Russians or Ukrainians among the leading publicists of the "Small People". The strength of this psychology lies in such openness: otherwise the whole movement would be locked in a narrow circle and could not have such an impact on the entire people.

Apparently, in the life of the "Small People", who now lives in our country, Jewish influence plays an exceptionally large role: judging by the extent to which the entire literature of the "Small People" is saturated with the ideas of Jewish nationalism, it is natural to think that it is from the nationalist-minded Jews that is the central core around which this layer crystallizes. Their role can be compared with the role of an enzyme that accelerates and directs the process of formation of the "Small People". However, the category of the "Small People" itself is broader: it would exist without this influence, although its activity and role in the life of the country would probably be much less.

§ 7. SICK QUESTION

But if we accept that the heightened Russophobic character of the literature of the "Small People" is explained by the influence of some Jewish nationalist movements, then the question still remains: why a certain trend of Jewish nationalism can be imbued with such irritation, not to say - hatred of Russia, Russian history and Russian in general? The answer will be obvious if you pay attention to the problem with which almost every work of Russophobic literature comes into contact in one way or another: WHAT INFLUENCE ON THE FATE OF THIS COUNTRY HAVE AN UNPRECEDENTED IMPACT OF JEWISH NATIONAL FORCES IN POLITICAL LIFE - AT EVERY TIME IN ANY TIME? This question must be very painful for the Jewish nationalist consciousness.

Indeed, there was hardly another case in history when people from the Jewish part of its population would have had such a tremendous influence on the life of any country. Therefore, in any discussion of the role of Jews in any country, the experience of Russia will be one of the main arguments for a very long time. And above all in our country, where we are doomed for a long time to unravel the knots tightened in that era. On the other hand, this issue is becoming more and more urgent all over the world, especially in America, where just now the "lobby" of Jewish nationalism has reached such an inexplicable influence influence the interests of a numerically small group of the population or when congressmen and senators reproach the president for that his actions could weaken the state of Israel - and the president, instead of reminding them that they should be guided by American, not Israeli interests, apologizes and proves that Israel will not suffer any damage [Here is one of countless examples. In a broadcast on April 29, 1979, Voice of America began its news report with the announcement that four Jews convicted in the USSR for attempting to hijack an airplane and now amnestied had arrived in Israel. "Their release is seen as Moscow's attempt to expand US-Soviet trade." Everyone is already so accustomed that there is no need to explain to anyone, what does the release of the four Jewish terrorists have to do with Soviet-American trade? And no one is surprised that the State Department organizes press conferences for terrorists, that they are received by the highest US officials, they speak in the English parliament.]. In such a situation, naturally, there may be a desire to get acquainted with the consequences of the same influence in the fate of another country.

As far as I know, this problem has never been raised by the Russian side (here, not in emigration). But it clearly worries the other side and all the time pops up in the literature of the "Small People" and in the works of the latest emigration. Although the problem is often named, it is either formulated in such a way that the absurdity, inappropriateness of the question itself becomes completely obvious, or is immediately closed with the help of the first argument that comes across. For example, "Jews were not alone in making the revolution," says anonymous NN, brilliantly refuting the view that "Jews alone did the revolution" (which, however, could not have been expressed by any reasonable person). One author in the "Continent" admits the participation of Jews in the revolution by 14% (!) - "We will be responsible for these 14%!" Here's another

example: the play "Weary Sun" (generally remarkable for its bubbling hatred of Russians), published in a magazine published in Russian in Tel Aviv. The author is Nina Voronel, a recent emigrant from the USSR (maybe the play was written here?). In the play, the coward and scoundrel Astrov argues with the pure, principled Venya. Astrov shouts: "... you are not responsible, but you arrange revolutions for us, abolish our God, destroy churches." - "What are you worth if you can arrange a revolution!" - retorts Venya. Many authors reject the idea of a strong Jewish influence on Russian history as offensive to the Russian people, although this is the only point at which they are ready to show such delicacy to Russians. In recent work, Pomerantz is circling around this "damn question." Then he asks if there were Jews participating in the revolutionary movement,

"And who is Wrangel (ie, is he a German?). Trotsky? It depends on your political views, reader." That reveals the universal pattern of Russian life - that non-Russians have always played a leading role in it: "Even in the novels of Russian writers, what surnames do businesslike, energetic people bear? Konstzhoglo, Insarov, Stolz ... A place for Levinson was already prepared in advance." Even such a "thought experiment" is being set up: if the oprichnik Fedka Basmanov were transferred to our century and made the people's commissar of railway transport, then, the author claims, the trains would certainly go off the rails, but "the bastard Kaganovich's trains ran on schedule (as before by Kleinmichel) "- although the author should have remembered the primordial chaos that reigned on the railways when he commanded them" this is their country: "Blumkin, who is drunk making a list for execution, is unthinkable in Israel: there is no drunkenness, no executions." (Except perhaps the executions of Arab peasants, as in the village of Deir Yasin! - Auth.) The last reasoning has a subtext in all Russophobic literature: if there was anything, the Russians themselves are to blame, they have cruelty in their blood, this is their whole story ... It is this leitmotif that gives such a bright anti-Russian shade to the ideology of our contemporary "Small People", which is why it becomes necessary to prove again and again the cruelty and barbarity of the Russians. this is their country: "Blumkin, who is drunk making a list for execution, is unthinkable in Israel: there is no drunkenness, no executions." (Except perhaps the executions of Arab peasants, as in the village of Deir Yasin! - Auth.) The last reasoning has a subtext in all Russophobic literature: if there was anything, the Russians themselves are to blame, they have cruelty in their blood, this is their whole story ... It is this leitmotif that gives such a bright anti-Russian shade to the ideology of our contemporary "Small People", which is why it becomes necessary to prove again and again the cruelty and barbarity of the Russians.) The last argument runs through the subtext in all Russophobic literature: if there was anything, the Russians themselves are to blame, they have cruelty in their blood, this is their whole story. It is this leitmotif that gives such a bright anti-Russian shade to the ideology of our contemporary "Small People", which

is why it becomes necessary to prove again and again the cruelty and barbarity of the Russians.

However, there is nothing specifically Jewish in such a reaction: in the past of every person and every nation there are episodes that you do not want to remember, it is much easier to convince yourself that there is nothing to remember. As a human being, one should rather be surprised that there were honest and courageous attempts to figure out what happened. Such an attempt was the collection *Russia and the Jews*, published in Berlin in 1923. There were also other attempts. They inspire hope that relations between peoples could be determined not by selfishness and mutual hatred, but by repentance and goodwill. They lead to an important question: do we need to reflect on the role of Jews in our history, do we not have enough of our sins, mistakes and problems? Isn't the path of repentance of every nation for its mistakes more fruitful? Surely this is the highest point of view, and one cannot escape the consciousness of one's historical sins, no matter how difficult it is, especially in the face of malicious and unscrupulous attacks, such as those that we have cited in large numbers. But it is quite obvious that humanity is far from mature enough to be limited only by this path. If we are faced with a painful problem, on the understanding of which, perhaps, the fate of our people depends, then the feeling of national self-preservation does not allow us to turn away from it, forbid ourselves to think about it in the hope that others will solve it for us. Moreover, this hope is very fragile. After all, those attempts to analyze the relationship of Jews with other peoples, about which we spoke, did not cause any broad response. The authors of the collection *"Russia and the Jews"* very vividly describe the hostile attitude,

Yes, and all this could still be neglected if it was a question of the fate of each of us individually, but we are also responsible to our people, so no matter how painful this problem is, it is impossible to avoid it.

And it's not easy to discuss it. Life in a country where so many nationalities collide and national feelings are heightened to the limit, develops, often even unconscious, habit of carefully avoiding national problems, not making them the subject of discussion. To speak out on this issue, it is necessary to overcome internal resistance. However, the choice has already been made by those authors whose views and statements we have cited. It cannot really be assumed that one people, the peculiarities of its history, national character and religious views, was discussed (often, as we have seen, extremely viciously and unceremoniously), while the discussion of others would be unacceptable.

But here, a deeply rooted, imposed prohibition is blocking us like a monolithic block, making any attempt to understand this question almost hopeless. It consists in the fact that any thought that sometime or somewhere the actions of some Jews have brought harm to other peoples, and even any objective research that does not exclude from the very beginning the possibility of such a conclusion, is declared reactionary, unintelligent, unscrupulous.

The relationship between any nation: Germans and French, British and Irish, or Persians and Kurds can be freely discussed and objectively pointed to cases where one side has suffered from the other. You can talk about the selfish position of the nobility, about the pursuit of profits by the bourgeoisie, or

about the ingrained conservatism of the peasantry. But in relation to Jews, such judgments, regardless of whether they are justified or not, are in principle prohibited from this point of view. This prohibition, never explicitly expressed or recorded, is strictly observed by all modern civilized mankind, and this is all the more striking the more free, "open" society claims to be, and most strikingly - in the United States.

A striking example of the naked application of this position is in a recent article by Pomeranets. In one article, he discovers the phrase: "The Cheka apparatus abounded in Latvians, Poles, Jews, Magyars, Chinese" and writes about this:

He lists, without any hypocrisy, Latvians, Poles, Jews, Magyars and Chinese. The dangerous word is stuck in the middle so that it cannot be pulled out for quotation.

The word "dangerous" is underlined by me. I would very much like to understand how Pomerantz explains that it is precisely this word "shoved into the middle" that is dangerous, and not the one, for example, which stands at the end, although there are 50 times more Chinese than Jews in the world. And it was no longer dangerous for him to call the Russians "imperfections" and "lackeys"? It is very characteristic that Pomerantz by no means disputes the fact itself, he even sneers at the author's caution:

However, excuse me, did the Jews really play a third-rate role in the Russian revolution? Fewer Poles, more Magyars? Contemporaries looked at these things differently ...

He simply warns that the author is approaching the border, which is unacceptable to cross.

And in this Pomerantz is right - the "word" is really dangerous! Anyone who dares to violate the above prohibition is accused of "anti-Semitism". The outspoken Yanov threatens with this especially openly. Referring to the "nationalists", he says:

... they will object to me that anti-Semitism is an atomic bomb in the arsenal of their opponents. But if so, then why not deprive your opponents of their main weapon by publicly renouncing ... etc.

This "main weapon" of "opponents of nationalism" not specified by Yanov is indeed a "weapon of intimidation" comparable to an atomic bomb. It is not for nothing that in our time the most principled thinkers bypass a dangerous topic, here the most courageous people fall silent.

What is this "atomic bomb"? Everyone knows that anti-Semitism is dirty, uncivilized, that it is a disgrace of the 20th century (as, indeed, of all other centuries). It was explained by the savagery, underdevelopment of capitalist relations, or, conversely, the decay of capitalism, or even the envy of less talented nations towards more talented ones. Bebel considered it a special kind of socialism: "the socialism of fools." Stalin - "remnants of cannibalism", Freud explained by the antipathy caused by circumcision in uncircumcised (in whom circumcision is subconsciously associated with the unpleasant idea of castration). Others considered it a relic of the Marcionite heresy, condemned in the 2nd century by the Church, or blasphemy against the Mother of God. But no one has ever explained what, it would seem, it was necessary to start with, what it is, anti-Semitism, what is meant by this word? In fact, we are talking about the very prohibition: to prevent even as an assumption that the actions of some Jewish groups, movements, personalities could have negative consequences for others. But, of course, it is impossible to form it so openly. Therefore, it is in vain to seek an answer, it will not be given, for here lies the power of this atomic bomb: in the fact that the question is taken from the sphere of reason into the realm of emotions and suggestions. We are dealing with a symbol, a sign, the function of which is to mobilize irrational emotions, to cause a tide of irritation, indignation, and hatred on a signal. Such symbols or cliches, which are a signal for a spontaneous reaction, are a well-known element of mass consciousness control. currents, personalities could have negative consequences for others. But, of course, it is impossible to form it so openly. Therefore, it is in vain to seek an answer, it will not be given, for here lies the power of this atomic bomb: in the fact that the question is taken from the sphere of reason into the realm of emotions and suggestions. We are dealing with a symbol, a sign, the function of which is to mobilize irrational emotions, to cause a tide of irritation, indignation, and hatred on a signal. Such symbols or cliches, which are a signal for a spontaneous reaction, are a well-known element of mass consciousness control. currents, personalities could have negative consequences for others. But, of course, it is impossible to form it so openly. Therefore, it is in vain to seek an answer, it will not be given, for here lies the power of this atomic bomb: in the fact that the question is taken from the sphere of reason into the realm of emotions and suggestions. We are dealing with a symbol, a sign, the function of which is to mobilize irrational emotions, to cause a tide of irritation, indignation, and hatred on a signal. Such symbols or cliches, which are a signal for a spontaneous reaction, are a well-known element of mass consciousness control. that the question is being withdrawn from the realm of reason into the realm of emotions and suggestions. We are dealing with a symbol, a sign, the function of which is to mobilize irrational emotions, to cause a tide of irritation, indignation, and hatred on a signal. Such symbols or cliches, which are a signal for a spontaneous reaction, are a well-known element of mass consciousness control. that the question is being withdrawn from the realm of reason into the realm of emotions and suggestions. We are dealing with a symbol, a sign, the function of which is to mobilize irrational emotions, to cause a tide of irritation, indignation, and hatred on a signal. Such symbols or cliches, which are a signal for a spontaneous reaction, are a well-known element of mass consciousness control.

And they usually use the stamp of "anti-Semitism" precisely as a means of influencing emotions, deliberately ignoring logic, trying to divert from any contact with it. Vivid

examples can be found in the author, generally very concerned about this topic, A. Sinyavsky. In the article already cited by us in No. 1 of the magazine "Continent", he writes:

It is appropriate here to say a few words in defense of anti-Semitism in Russia. That is: what good is hidden in a psychological sense in Russian hostility (put it mildly) towards Jews.

And he explains that no matter how many misfortunes a Russian person has done, he simply cannot comprehend that all this came from his own actions, and he brings sin on some "saboteurs" - in particular, on the Jews. But then, rising to pathos, the author on Jewish emigration (to which, of course, the Jews were brought by the Russians), exclaims: "Russia is Mother, Russia is Bitch, you will answer for this next one, fed by you and thrown into the trash (?) child".

You see, the author even takes Russians under his protection, tries, as much as possible, to excuse their anti-Semitism, to find something "good" in it, because they do not know what they are doing, and in more modern terminology they are insane (although Russia is will answer for this, and for something else ...). And even from such a defender, the reader takes on faith, without a single proof, the assertion that Russians are "unfriendly" to Jews as a nation, and does not ponder whether Jews are always "friendly" to Russians.

In what other question would such a trick get away with! And here these thoughts are recognized as so important that in the English translation they are communicated to the American reader.

In a later article by the same author, several statements by "the writer N.N." like that there were Jewish pogroms under Monomakh, or that now in the Moscow organization of the Union of Jewish Writers 80%. Without trying to assess the correctness of this figure, or what influence such a state of affairs could have on the development of Russian literature, the author claims that N. N. calls for "starting pogroms, girding with Monomakh" and even "we are dealing (.. .) with Orthodox fascism ". It can be seen that the goal is to lead the reader away from the uncomfortable soil of facts and reflections for the author. Instead, the image of the Russians is instilled - almost insane idiots, and any unpleasant statements are repainted under calls for pogroms. In Russophobic literature, we have come across such confident accusations of Russians in the absence of respect for other people's opinions! The authors have so often proclaimed "pluralism" and "tolerance" that it would seem that we could expect to find these traits in them. However, when they are faced with painful issues for them, they not only do not show tolerance and respect for other people's opinions, but bluntly declare their opponents fascists and almost murderers. But it is precisely in difficult, painful situations that only "pluralism" and "tolerance" are tested. If you try to understand on this model what the authors mean by freedom of thought and speech, then it might seem that they understand it as freedom of their thought and freedom of speech only for its expression! However, when they are faced with painful issues for them, they not only do

not show tolerance and respect for other people's opinions, but bluntly declare their opponents fascists and almost murderers. But it is precisely in difficult, painful situations that only "pluralism" and "tolerance" are tested. If you try to understand on this model what the authors mean by freedom of thought and speech, then it might seem that they understand it as freedom of their thought and freedom of speech only for its expression! However, when they are faced with painful issues for them, they not only do not show tolerance and respect for other people's opinions, but bluntly declare their opponents fascists and almost murderers. But it is precisely in difficult, painful situations that only "pluralism" and "tolerance" are tested. If you try to understand on this model what the authors mean by freedom of thought and speech, then it might seem that they understand it as freedom of their thought and freedom of speech only for its expression!

More rationally, reasonably, the same prohibition is expressed in this form: any judgment about the whole people is unjustified, this denies the autonomy of human individuality, some people become responsible for the actions of others. But, having accepted this point of view, we should have completely abandoned the use of general categories in history: estate, class, nation, state. However, for some reason such objections are not raised by such thoughts that "Russia has brought more evil into the world than any other country", nor by the recent demands in the United States (by Jewish authors) to cover more the contribution (of course, positive) of Jews to American culture (too, after all - a judgment about the whole nation!).

Most importantly, no denial of individuality occurs here. For example, we have given above arguments in favor of the fact that the Russophobic literature we are analyzing is strongly influenced by Jewish nationalist feelings. But after all, not all Jews take part in this literature! There are those who object to it (we have named some of them above). So here the freedom of manifestation of one's individuality remains completely and no one is held responsible for actions that they did not perform.

Since we have already said the word "responsibility", we will allow ourselves one more clarification. In this work, we generally reject all "value judgments", from posing the question "who is to blame?" (and how much). Further we will try only to understand: what is happening? How was the role that some strata of Jewry played during the "revolutionary century" - from the middle of the 19th to the middle of the 20th centuries, reflected on the history of our country?

§ 8. JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE "REVOLUTIONARY AGE"

At the end of the 19th century, the stable, closed life of religious communities that united almost all Jews living in Russia began to quickly disintegrate. Young people left religious schools and patriarchal shelter and poured into Russian life - economy, culture, politics, more and more influencing it. By the beginning of the XX century, this influence reached such a scale that it became a significant factor in Russian history. If it was great in the economy, then it was especially striking in all currents hostile to the then way of life. In the liberal denunciatory press, in the left parties and terrorist groups, Jews, both in number and in their leading role, occupied a position completely incomparable with their numerical share in the population:

... an unconditional fact that must be explained, but senseless and aimless to deny - objective Jewish observers wrote about this (the collection "Russia and the Jews" cited above).

Naturally, the whole process became especially aggravated when the revolution broke out. In the same collection we read:

Now a Jew is in all corners, at all levels of power. The Russian person sees him at the head of the capital city of Moscow, and at the head of the Nevskaya capital, and at the head of the army, the most perfect mechanism of self-destruction. He sees that St. Vladimir Avenue bears the glorious name of Nakhimson, the historic Liteiny Avenue has been renamed into Volodarsky Avenue, and Pavlovsk - into Slutsk. The Russian man now sees the Jew as both a judge and an executioner ...

Nevertheless, the idea that "the revolution was done only by the Jews" is nonsense, probably invented only to make it easier to refute. Moreover, I do not see any arguments in favor of the fact that the Jews "made" a revolution at all, ie. were its initiators, at least in the form of a leading minority.

If you start the history of the revolution with Bakunin, Herzen and Chernyshevsky, then there were no Jews in their environment, and Bakunin generally treated Jews with antipathy. When the first revolutionary proclamations arose ("Towards a Young Russia" and others), during the period of "going to the people" and when after its failure there was a turn to terror, Jews in the revolutionary movement were a rare exception. At the very end of the 70s, there were several Jews in the leadership of Narodnaya Volya (Goldenberg, Deich, Zundeleovich, Gesya Gelfman), which, after the assassination of Alexander II, led to outbreaks of popular indignation directed against the Jews. But how weak the influence of the Jews was in the leadership of the organization, is shown by the fact that the "Leaf of the Narodnaya Volya" APPROVED these riots, explaining them by the indignation of the people against the Jewish exploiters. By the end of the 1880s, the situation had changed somewhat. According to a summary compiled by the Ministry of the Interior, Jews made up slightly more than a third of the political emigrants known to him - 51 to 145. Only after the creation of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party did the Jews form a solid majority in the leadership of this movement. For example, here is a

short history of the Combat Organization: it was created and led by Gershuni from 1901 to 1903, from 1903 to 1906 - by Azev [It seems that his surname should be pronounced Azev, not Azef.], From 1906 to 1907 - Zilberberg. After that, Nikitenko became the head, but two months later he was arrested, and in 1908 it was dissolved (when the role of Azev became clear). Abundant material in this regard is provided by the reports of Azev, later published. In one of them, he lists the members of the foreign committee: Gots, Chernov, Shishko, the Levites' spouses, the wife of Gots, Minora, Gurevich and Chernov's wife, and in the other - "a narrow circle of party leaders": Mendel, Wittenberg, Levin, Levit and Azev. We see a similar evolution in social democracy. The idea that not the peasants, but the workers can become the main revolutionary force, was expressed in relation to Russia not by the Jews, but by Yakubovich and especially by Plekhanov, who began to transplant Marxism on Russian soil. In the social democracy, at first, there were much more Jews among the Mensheviks than among the Bolsheviks (in a note on the 5th Congress of the RSDLP, Stalin wrote that the overwhelming majority of the Menshevik faction were Jews, and in the Bolsheviks - Russians, and he quoted a well-known "joke", which is not bad to arrange a Jewish pogrom in Russian Social-Democracy). Jewish forces began to flow to the Bolsheviks only just before the October coup and especially after it - from the Mensheviks, from the Bund (many Bund leaders went over to the Bolshevik Party), from non-party people. After the coup, Kamenev was the head of state for several days, then Sverdlov until his death. Trotsky was at the head of the army, Zinoviev was at the head of Petrograd, Kamenev was at the head of Moscow, Zinoviev was at the head, the Profintern was headed by A. Lozovsky (Solomon Drizo), Oskar Ryvkin was at the head of the Komsomol (at first, for several months, Efim Tsetlin), etc.

The situation in the 30s can be imagined, for example, according to the lists given in Dikiy's book. If in the most supreme leadership the number of Jewish names decreases, then in lower instances the influence expands, goes deeper. In the responsible people's commissariats (OGPU, foreign affairs, heavy industry) in the leading elite (people's commissars, their deputies, members of the collegium), Jews occupied a dominant position, knowingly made up more than half. In some areas, the leadership was almost entirely Jewish.

But these are all just quantitative estimates. What was the nature of the influence that radical Jewry had on that era? A particularly large concentration of Jewish names in the most painful moments is striking, among the leaders and performers of the actions, who especially sharply reshaped life, contributed to the rupture of historical traditions, the destruction of historical roots.

For example, from most memoirs of the civil war, a strange picture emerges: when Cheka figures are mentioned, Jewish surnames are surprisingly often emerging - whether we are talking about Kiev, Kharkov, Petrograd, Vyatka or Turkestan. And this at a time when Jews constituted only 1 - 2% of the population of Soviet Russia! So, Shulgin gives a list of employees of the Kiev Cheka: it contains almost exclusively Jewish surnames. And he tells about this example of her activities: in Kiev before the

revolution there was a "Union of Russian Nationalists" - its members were shot according to the lists.

This feature is especially vivid in connection with the execution of Nicholas II and his family. After all, it was not about the elimination of the pretenders to the throne of their predecessor - like the murder of Peter III or Paul I: Nicholas II was shot exactly as Tsar, this ritual act drew a line under the centuries-old era of Russian history, so this can only be compared with the execution of Charles I in England or Louis XIV in France. It would seem that representatives of an insignificant ethnic minority should have kept as far away as possible from such a painful action that leaves a mark on the entire history of action. What names do we meet? Yakov Yurovsky personally supervised the execution and shot at the Tsar, Beloborodov (Weisbart) was the chairman of the local council, and Shaya Goloshchekin was the general leadership in Yekaterinburg. The picture is complemented by the fact that on the wall of the room, where the execution took place, a couplet written (in German) from Heine's poem about King Belshazzar, who insulted Jehovah and was killed for this, was discovered. But on another occasion, we learn from it that inscriptions in Yiddish were found on the walls of the house where the execution of the royal family took place!]. Or here's another era: the composition of the top of the OGPU in the period of dispossession and the White Sea Canal, at a turning point in our history, when the fate of the peasantry was decided (it is given in the book of an English researcher who does not at all want to emphasize the national aspect): chairman Yagoda (Iguda), deputies - Agranov, Trilisser, later Frinovsky; the head of the operative department - Valovich, later Pauker; head of the GULAG - Matvey Berman, then Frenkel; political department - Lyashkov; economic department - Mironov; special department - Guy, foreign department - head Slutsky, deputy - Boris Berman and Shpilgelglass; transport department - Shanin. And when Yagoda was replaced by Yezhov, Berman and Frinovsky were his deputies. Or, finally, the destruction of the Orthodox Church: in the 1920s, it was led by Trotsky (under his closest assistant, Spitsberg), and in the 30s by Emelyan Yaroslavsky (Minei Izrailevich Gubelman). The period when the campaign has already assumed a grandiose scale is highlighted in a samizdat letter by the late Ukrainian academician Beletsky. For example, he gives a list of the main authors of atheistic (i.e. almost exclusively anti-Orthodox) literature: Emelyan Yaroslavsky (Gubelman), Rumyantsev (Schneider), Candidov (Fridman), Zakharov (Edelstein), Ranovich, Shakhnovich, Skvortsov-Stepanov,

The most fatal feature of this entire century, which can be attributed to the ever-increasing Jewish influence, was that often liberal, Westernizing, or internationalist phraseology covered up anti-national tendencies. (Of course, many Russians, Ukrainians, Georgians were also involved in this.) This is a fundamental difference from the French revolution, in which the Jews did not play any role. There "patriot" was a term for a revolutionary, in our country it was a counter-revolutionary, it could also be found in the death sentence: "shot as a conspirator, monarchist and patriot." And in Russia this trait did not appear immediately. There were some national elements in Bakunin's thinking, he dreamed of a federation of anarchist-free Slavic peoples. The bait that lured most of the youth into the revolution there was love and compassion for the people, i.e. - to the peasantry. But the opposite tendency also began early. Thus, L.

Tikhomirov talks about V. A. Zaitsev (we have already quoted him in § 4, for example, that "slavery is in the blood of the Russians"): cursed her, so it was disgusting to read. He wrote, for example: "perish, damned." About Plekhanov, Tikhomirov writes that he "carried in his chest indestructible Russian patriotism." And so, after returning to Russia after the February Revolution, he discovered that his former influence evaporated. Plekhanov simply would not have turned his tongue to exclaim like Trotsky: "Damn patriotism!" This "antipatriotic" mood prevailed in the 1920s and 1930s. he could be found in many speeches of the then leaders. The "antipatriotic" mood has permeated literature as well. Bezymensky dreamed:

Oh, how soon will
Rassiyushka be pushed out of the way with a hard hand ?

This theme varied indefinitely:

Russia! Rotten? Is she dead? Are you dead?
What! Eternal memory to you.

(Alexandrovsky)

Or:

I propose to
melt Minin,
Pozharsky.
Why do they need a pedestal?
Enough for us to
praise two shopkeepers, October found them
behind the counters
. We didn't break our neck by
chance
.
I know it would be a match ,
Just think,
They saved Raseya!
Or maybe it would have been better not to save?

(Jack Altauzen [Yakov Moiseevich Altauzen.])

Studying Russian history included, as an obligatory part, pouring slop on everyone who played some role in the fate of Russia - even at the expense of contradicting the beliefs of the researchers themselves: for whether, for example, Peter the Great was a syphilitic or a homosexual, this did not have any influence on "commercial capital", "the spokesman for the interests of which he was."

Through literature and school, this mood has penetrated into the souls of today's generations - and here, for example, L. Plyushch calls Kutuzov a "reactionary leader"!

It is pertinent here to consider the often raised objection: the Jews who took part in this trend belonged to Jewry only by blood, but in spirit they were internationalists; the fact that they were Jews did not affect their activities in any way. But, for example, the same authors declare Stalin to be "the successor of the policy of Russian tsarism," although in his speeches he tirelessly denounced "great-power chauvinism." If they do not believe Stalin's word, then why do they believe Trotsky and consider him a pure internationalist? It is precisely this point of view that Pomerantz has, of course, in mind when he writes that if Trotsky is considered a Jew, then Wrangel must be considered a German. Who were they really? "This question seems insoluble to me," says Pomerantz. At the same time, at least with regard to Trotsky, the situation does not seem so hopeless. For example, in one of his biographies we read:

Apparently, the rationalistic approach to the Jewish question demanded of him by the Marxism he professed did not in any way express his true feelings. It even seems that he was "obsessed" in his own way by this question; he wrote about him almost more than any other revolutionary.

Just the comparison with Wrangel is instructive, Trotsky's deputy was Ephraim Sklyansky, and Wrangel's was General Shatilov, by no means a German. And there are no signs of any special sympathy for Wrangel, the desire to rehabilitate him on the part of German publicists, while this is not the case with Trotsky: for example, the same Pomerantz compares Trotsky's labor armies with the modern sending of students for potatoes! Whereas Trotsky himself used a completely different comparison - with serfdom, which he declared to be quite progressive for his time. Or V. Grossman in the novel "Everything flows", debunking both Stalin and Lenin, writes: "brilliant", "stormy, magnificent", "almost brilliant Trotsky." [V. S. Grossman is a Soviet writer and publicist. Together with Ehrenburg and Zaslavsky, he was the leading propagandist of the Stalinist era. At the same time, he secretly wrote several books that were published after his death. In one of them, "Everything flows," he, severely debunking Stalin and Lenin, spoke very sympathetically of Trotsky (from which the above quotations were taken). In the same book, he argues that the entire Russian history is the history of slavery, that the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave who perverted the freedom-loving ideas brought from the West (although in his official wartime journalism he spoke in a completely different language: in the Russian soul he saw "indestructible, violent force", "iron Avvakum's force, which can neither be bent nor broken, "etc.). Thus, V. Grossman can be considered as a predecessor of that trend,

Not only was this example of Pomerantz unsuccessful: both liberal and revolutionary leaders of Jewish origin were influenced by powerful nationalist sentiments. (Of course, this does not mean that this was the case with everyone.) For example, Vinaver, one of the most influential leaders of the Constitutional Democratic (Cadet) Party, after the revolution turned into an active Zionist. Or take the moment when the Socialist-

Revolutionary Party was formed. In his memoirs, one of the leading figures of that time (later one of the leaders of the French Communist Party), Charles Rappoport, writes:

Chaim Zhitlovsky, who, together with me, founded the Union of Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries in Bern, from which the Socialist-Revolutionary Party later grew [The author exaggerates somewhat: the Socialist-Revolutionary Party was formed from the merger of several organizations, including the aforementioned Union.]. ... This ardent and sincere patriot convinced me in a friendly way: be whatever you want - a socialist, communist, anarchist and so on, but, first of all, be a Jew, work among Jews, the Jewish intelligentsia must belong to the Jewish people.

The views of Rappoport himself are as follows:

the Jewish people are the bearers of all the great ideas of unity and human community in history ... The disappearance of the Jewish people will mean the death of humanity, the final transformation of man into a wild beast.

It is very difficult to imagine that the activities of such politicians (whether as Cadets, Socialist-Revolutionaries or French Communists) did not reflect their national feelings. Traces of this can actually be seen, for example, in the history of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. Thus, two of the most famous terrorist acts, which required the greatest efforts of the Combat Organization, were directed against Plehve and Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, whom rumor accused of anti-Semitism. (Plehve was considered responsible for the Kishinev pogrom, there was even a legend that he wanted to evict the Jews into the ghetto; Prince Sergei Alexandrovich, being the Moscow governor-general, restored some restrictions on the residence of Jews in the Moscow province, which had been canceled earlier.) Zubatov recalled, that in a conversation with him Azev

shook with anger and hatred, talking about Plehve, whom he considered responsible for the Kishinev pogrom. [There are many mysteries in the fate of Azev. Why, after exposure, he was not killed, while the party executed for much lesser offenses, only for attempts to betray (for example, Gapon)? It was believed that he was hiding, but Burtsev found him and interviewed him! Azev died a natural death in 1918. It is difficult to think of any other explanation than the fact that the party leadership knew about his cooperation with the authorities and authorized it under certain conditions.]

Rataev testifies to the same.

One of the leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, Sletov, recounts in his memoirs how the leaders of the party in Geneva reacted to the news of the murder of Plehve:

There was pandemonium for several minutes. Some men and women went into hysterics. Most of those present hugged. Shouts of joy were heard from all sides. I can still see N. standing aside, he smashed a glass of water on the floor, gritted his teeth and shouted: "This is for Chisinau!"

Here's another example. Soviet historian M.N. Pokrovsky says:

... I knew that back in 1907 the Kadet newspaper Nov in Moscow was subsidized by some kind of syndicate of the Jewish bourgeoisie, which cared most about the national side of the matter and, finding that the newspaper did not sufficiently protect the interests of Jews, came to our Bolshevik publicist M G. Lunzu and invited him to become the editor of the newspaper. He was extremely amazed, saying: "Why, it's a Cadet newspaper, and I'm a Bolshevik." They say to him: "It's all the same. We think that your attitude to the national question is clearer."

The idea that a political coup can be a tool for achieving national goals is not alien to Jewish consciousness. For example, Witte says that when in 1905 he was negotiating a peace treaty with Japan in America, a "delegation of Jewish aces" came to him, including Jacob Schiff, "the head of the Jewish financial world in America." They were worried about the situation of Jews in Russia. Witte's words that "giving equality at once will do more harm than good", "provoked a sharp objection on the part of Schiff." Shulgin cites, with reference to the original source, the version of one of the Jewish participants in this meeting about what Schiff's "objection" was. According to him, Schiff said:

... then the revolution will erect a republic through which the rights will be obtained.

As a continuation of this story, another one can be cited, which took place in 1911 - 1912. During these years, a stormy campaign of protest was played out in America against the fact that, according to the then Russian laws, the entry of American Jews into Russia was limited. They demanded that the Russian-American trade agreement of 1832 be broken (the agreement was terminated, in exactly the same way as today the trade agreement was not signed due to the fact that the departure of Jews from the USSR to the United States was restricted.) Speaking at the rally, the minister Hermann Loeb (the aforementioned Schiff was the CEO of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.) said that canceling the contract is good, but even better is to smuggle weapons to Russia and send a hundred instructors:

Let them teach our guys, let them teach them how to kill oppressors like dogs. Cowardly Russia was forced to give in to the little Japanese. She will yield to the People Chosen by God Money will help us achieve this.

There are many more such examples, they are not enough, of course, to understand how exactly national feelings influenced Jewish politicians, but they show that such an influence undoubtedly existed in many cases.

§ 9. PAST AND PRESENT

Why did it happen that it was precisely those who came from the Jewish environment that turned out to be the nucleus of the "Small People", which had a fatal role in the crisis epoch of our history? We will not try to reveal the deep meaning of this phenomenon. Probably, the foundations are religious, associated with belief in the "Chosen People" and in the power over the world intended for them. What other nation was brought up from generation to generation on such covenants:

... the Lord your God leads you to the land that He swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to give you with big and good cities that you did not build.

And with houses filled with all good, which you did not fill, and with wells hewn out of stone, which you did not hew, and with vineyards and olives, which you did not plant ... (Deuteronomy, VI, 10-11).

Then the sons of foreigners will build your walls, and their kings will serve you; for in my anger I struck you, but in my favor I will be merciful to you.

And your gates will always be open, they will not be closed either day or night, so that the wealth of the nations may be brought to you and their kings be brought.

For the people and kingdoms that do not want to serve you will perish, and such nations will be completely destroyed. (Isaiah 60, 10-12).

And strangers will come and feed your flocks; and the sons of strangers will be your cultivators and your winegrowers. (Isaiah 61, 5).

And kings shall be thy nourishers, and their queens thy nurses; They will bow down to you with their faces to the ground and lick the dust of your feet. (Isaiah 49.23).

Who can have similar feelings:

As for the other nations descended from Adam, You said that they were nothing, but like saliva, and You likened their multitude to drops dripping from a vessel. (III book. Ezra, 6, 56).

If this century has been created for us, why don't we receive the heritage with the century? And how long is it? (III book. Ezra, 6, 56) [III book of Ezra is not included in the Jewish Canon - it belongs to the current of Jewish apocalypticism. It is believed that the introduction and conclusion (chap. 1-3 and 15-16) were added by a Christian author, and the central part (from

which the quotes are taken) reproduces the original Jewish material (see, for example, D. Hastings' Bible Dictionary).]

It is this worldview of the "Chosen People" that was the prototype of the ideology of the "Small People" in all its historical incarnations (which is especially clear from the example of the Puritans, who even used the same terminology - among the newest authors, Pomerantz uses it).

However, here I will point out only the most obvious reason - almost two thousand years of isolation and a suspicious, hostile attitude towards the outside world. Of course, the question also arises about the reasons and the meaning of this isolation. For example, such a thorough and objective researcher as Max Weber believes that the isolation of Jewry was not forced, but voluntarily chosen long before the destruction of the Temple. In this, the Soviet historian S. Lurie agrees with him in his work "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World." He believes that in the era preceding the destruction of the Temple, most of the Jews already lived in the diaspora, and Judea played the role of a cult and national center (obviously, somewhat reminiscent of the modern state of Israel).

But in order not to delve into this chain of riddles, we will take as its given its final link - dispersion and isolation. Twenty centuries have been lived among foreign peoples in complete isolation from all the influences of the outside world, perceived as "clubs", a source of infection and sin. The statements of the Talmud and commentaries to it are well known, in which it is explained from different points of view that a person of another faith (Akum) cannot be regarded as a person: for this reason, one should not be afraid to desecrate their graves; in the event of the death of an Akum servant, one should not address the consolation of his master, but express the hope that God will compensate him for the loss - as in the case of the death of cattle; for the same reason, marriage with Akum has no effect, his seed is the same as the seed of cattle, Akum are animals with human faces, etc., etc. Thousands of years every year on the "Purim" holiday the killing by the Jews of 75,000 of their enemies, including women and children, was celebrated, as described in the book of Esther. And it is celebrated to this day - a merry carnival is taking place in Israel on this occasion. For comparison, let us imagine that Catholics would annually celebrate the night of St. Bartholomew! Finally, I will refer to a source that cannot be suspected of hostility to the Jews: the famous Zionist, friend and executor of Kafka, Max Brod, in his book about Reuchlin, informs about the Jewish prayer he knows against the Gentiles with calls to God to deprive them of hope, to disperse, to overthrow them. , <B] exterminate in an instant and in "our days". One can imagine what an indelible mark such an upbringing, which began from childhood, and a life lived according to such canons, and so on from generation to generation - 20 centuries, should have left in the soul.

What attitude towards the surrounding population could arise on this basis, you can try to restore from small lines scattered in many sources. For example, in his diary, young Lassalle, more than once indignant at the oppressed position of the Jews, says that he would have dreamed of standing at their head with arms in hand. In connection with rumors of ritual killings, he writes:

The fact that such accusations are being made in all corners of the world, it seems to me, portends that the time will soon come when we will really be liberated by the shedding of Christian blood. The game has begun, and it's up to the players.

If we also take into account the malice and rancor that are visible on every page of this diary, then it is easy to imagine that such experiences should have left a mark for life. Or Martov (Zederbaum), recalling the fear experienced at the age of three while expecting a pogrom (the crowd was dispersed by the Cossacks even before it reached the Zederbaum house), thinks:

Would I have been what I have become if Russian reality had not hastened to capture its rough fingers on the plastic young soul and carefully bury the seeds of salutary hatred under the cover of pity stirred up in a child's heart?

More explicit evidence can be found in the literature. For example, <BI] "salutary hatred" is widely spread in the verses of the Jewish poet who lived in Russia - H. Bialik:

"Let it ooze like unrevenged blood into hell,
And let it dig in the darkness, and let it
grind away like poison. Eating away the pillars of the universe."
"Let our sorrow become like a bone of an evil dog,
In the throat of the world insatiable;
And the sky will give water, and the whole surface of the earth,
And the steppe, and the forest with burning poison,
And it will live with us, and bloom, and fade,
And bloom still mighty ".

"For this I have locked it in your throat,
O man, your groaning;
Do not desecrate, like those, with the water of sobs, the
holy pain of your holy sufferings,
But take care of it intact.
Cherish it, keep it dearer than treasure
And build a castle for her in your chest,
Build a stronghold from the hatred of hell -
And do not give her food, except the poison of
Your grievances and your wounds, and wait,
And the cherished seed
will grow, And the burning one will give fruit full of poison -
And on the terrible day, when the time is
finished , Tear it - and throw it into people!

"From the abyss of Avadonna, lift up the song of Destruction,
That, like your spirit, is black with fire,
And scatter among the nations, and poison everything in their accursed
house with the

suffocation of intoxication;
And let each one sow in the fields their seed of decay Wherever
he steps and stands .
If you only touch the purest of the lilies of their garden, It will
turn black and wither;
And if your gaze falls on the marble of their statues -
Cracked, broken in two;
And take laughter with you, bitter, damned,
To kill all living things. "

Contempt and disgust towards Russians, Ukrainians, Poles as beings of a lower type, subhumans, is felt in almost every story of I. Babel's "Cavalry". A full-fledged person, arousing respect and sympathy from the author, is found there only in the image of a Jew. With undisguised disgust, it is described how a Russian father cuts his son, and then the second son cuts his father ("Letter"), as a Ukrainian admits that he does not like to kill by shooting, but prefers to trample to death with his feet ("Life of Pavlichenka, Matvey Rodionych"). But the story "The Son of the Rabbi" is especially characteristic. The author is on the train with the retreating army:

And monstrous Russia, implausible, like a herd of body lice, stomped with bast shoes on both sides of the carriages. Typhoid peasants rolled in front of him the usual coffin of a soldier's death. It jumped onto the steps of our train and fell off, knocked down by butts.

But then the author sees a familiar face: "And then I recognized Ilya, the son of a Zhytomyr rabbi" (the author went to the rabbi on the evening before Saturday - although he was a political worker of the Red Army - and noted "a young man with Spinoza's face" - the story "Gidali"). Of course, he was immediately accepted into the editorial carriage. He was sick with typhus, at his last gasp and died there, on the train. "He died, the last prince, among poetry, phylacteria and footcloths. We buried him in a forgotten station. And I - barely containing in the ancient body of the storm of my imagination - I took my brother's last breath."

The cold detachment from the surrounding people is often conveyed by the poems of E. Bagritsky, but in the poem "February" extreme hatred breaks out. The hero becomes the assistant commissar after the revolution:

My Jewish pride sang,
Like a string stretched to failure ...
I would give a lot so that my ancestor
In a long-length dressing gown and a fox's hat,
From under which the
sidelocks and dandruff fell off in a gray spiral, Soaring
over a square beard ...
So that this ancestor recognized the descendant
In a fellow standing like a tower

Above the flying headlights and bayonets of the
Truck that shook midnight.

Once, during a raid on a suspicious house, the author recognizes a girl whom he saw before the revolution, she was a schoolgirl, often passed by him, and he sighed, not daring to approach her. Once he tried to speak, but she chased him away ... Now she has become a prostitute ...

I - Well, what! learned?
Silence.
- How much to give you per session?
And quietly,
Without separating her lips, she said:
- Have pity on me! No money needed ...
I threw money at her,
I burst in,
Without pulling off my boots, without taking off my holster,
Without unbuttoning my tunic.
I take you for being timid
Was my age, for being shy,
For the shame of my homeless ancestors,
For a random bird chirping!
I take you as revenge on the world,
From which I could not get out!
Take me to the empty bowels,
Where the grass cannot tie,
Maybe my night seed
Will fertilize your wilderness.

It seems to me that it is time to reconsider the traditional point of view on the novels of Ilf and Petrov. This is by no means an amusing ridicule of the vulgarity of the NEP era. In a soft but clear form, they develop a concept that, in my opinion, is their main content. Their action, as it were, takes place among the wreckage of the old Russian life, nobles, priests, intellectuals appear in the novels - and they are all depicted as some kind of ridiculous, unclean animals, causing disgust and disgust. They are not even attributed any traits for which a person could be condemned. Instead, a stamp is put on them, with the aim of precisely reducing, if not destroying, the feeling of community with them as with people, pushing them away from them purely physiologically: one is depicted naked, with a thick saggy belly covered with red hair; the other is told that he was flogged for

These feelings, carried by another generation, have survived to this day and often break through in the songs of bards, poems, novels and memoirs. A violent explosion of the same emotions can be seen in the works of recent emigrants. For example, a poem by the recently emigrated D. Markish, already published in Israel in the magazine "Zion":

I'm talking about us, the sons of Sinai,
About us, whose eyes are warmed with a different warmth.
Let the Russian people lead a different path,
We do not care about their Slavic deeds.
We ate their bread, but paid in blood.
Accounts saved but not posted.
We will take revenge - with flowers at the head of
Their northern country.
When the lacquer test is erased,
When the rumble of red screams dies out,
We will stand at the birch coffin
In the guard of honor ...

In an article published in another Israeli magazine, we read:

The people - the "god-bearer" of a huge, conformed country is not enough; they also need a pearl, that is, Holy Land ... He wants this holiness inaccessible to him, and although he himself - mired in contempt for himself and for everyone else - does not even know what to do with this holiness, because in his pagan-Christian concept, holiness is not living and cannot consecrate the world, he is still waiting for his hour of tyranny-executioner. And in his dark instinct it caused and causes monstrous outbursts of hatred towards Israel - the bearer of living holiness can be surpassed.].

At the end, we present an excerpt from a magazine published in Russian in Toronto:

Do not be silent, Lord, stand up for your chosen ones, not for our sake, for the sake of your oath to our fathers - Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Send a Chinese on them so that they praise Mao and work for him as we do for them. Lord, may the Chinese destroy all Russian schools and plunder them, may the Russians be forcibly Chineseized, may they forget their language and writing. May he organize a Russian national district for them in the Himalayas.

One often hears this argument: many actions and feelings of Jews can be understood if we remember how much they experienced. For example, some of Bialik's poems were written under the influence of pogroms, D. Markish's father was shot under Stalin in the "Zionist trial", others remember the Pale of Settlement, the percentage rate, or some later grievances. Here it should be emphasized once again that we are not going to judge, accuse or justify anyone in this work. The very posing of such a question hardly makes sense: does the humiliation of the Germans in the Versailles Peace justify National Socialism? We would only like to imagine what happened in our country, what social and national factors and how its history influenced.

Since the post-reform 60s, the word "revolution" has appeared on everyone's lips in Russia. This was a clear sign of an impending crisis. And as another sign of it, the "Small People" with all its inherent features began to form. A new type of people was created, like a young man (Tikhomirov talks about him), who proudly said: "I am a

renegade", or the Ishutinsky circle "Hell", the program of which was: "Replace personal joys with hatred and evil - and learn to live with this ". But you can understand what a painful operation it was, how difficult it was to tear a person away from his roots, how to turn him inside out, how for this it was necessary to carefully initiate him step by step into a new teaching, to suppress him by the power of authorities. And how much easier it was with the mass of Jewish youth, not only not connected by common roots with this country and people, but also perceived from the very childhood hostility to precisely these roots, when hostile alienation from the spiritual foundations of the surrounding life was absorbed not from books and abstracts, but was absorbed from early childhood, often completely unconsciously, from intonations in the conversations of adults, from remarks accidentally heard and remembered for a lifetime! And although the feelings reflected in the above passages were probably not experienced by all Jews, it was precisely the current that was penetrated by them that invaded life with unheard-of energy and was able to exert a particularly strong and painful influence on it. but it was absorbed from early childhood, often completely unconsciously, from the intonations in the conversations of adults, from the remarks accidentally heard and remembered for a lifetime! And although the feelings reflected in the above passages were probably not experienced by all Jews, it was precisely the current that was penetrated by them that invaded life with unheard-of energy and was able to exert a particularly strong and painful influence on it. but it was absorbed from early childhood, often completely unconsciously, from the intonations in the conversations of adults, from the remarks accidentally heard and remembered for a lifetime! And although the feelings reflected in the above passages were probably not experienced by all Jews, it was precisely the current that was penetrated by them that invaded life with unheard-of energy and was able to exert a particularly strong and painful influence on it.

It must be admitted that the crisis in our history took place at a completely unique moment. If at the time when it erupted, the Jews led the same isolated way of life, as, for example, in France during the Great Revolution, they would not have had a noticeable impact on its course. On the other hand, if the life of shtetl communities began to collapse much earlier, then, perhaps, some kind of ties between Jews and the rest of the population would have become stronger, the alienation caused by two thousand years of isolation would not have been so strong. Who knows how many generations it takes for the traces of a 20th century tradition to be erased? - but we were practically not given a single one, the influx of Jews into the terrorist movement almost exactly coincided with "emancipation", the beginning of the disintegration of Jewish communities, a way out of isolation. Pinhus Axelrod, Gesya Gelfman and many other leaders of the terrorists came from such strata of Jewry, where it was impossible to hear Russian speech at all. With a bundle on their backs, they set off to study "goy science" and soon found themselves among the leaders of the movement. The coincidence <B] of the two crises had a decisive impact on the character of that era. This is how Jewish observers saw it (all according to the same book "Russia and the Jews"):

And, of course, it is no coincidence that the Jews, who are so inclined to rationalistic thinking, for the most part not connected by any traditions with the world around them,

often in these traditions saw not only useless, but also trash harmful for the development of mankind, found themselves in such proximity to these revolutionary ideas.

And as a logical consequence:

We were amazed by what we least expected to meet in the Jewish environment: cruelty, sadism, violence, it seemed, were alien to a people far from physical, warlike life; yesterday who still did not know how to wield a gun, today they found themselves among the commanding thugs.

This remarkable book ends with the words:

One of two things: either foreigners without political rights, or Russian citizenship based on love for the motherland. There is no third option.

But there was a trend that chose exactly the third - "impossible", from the point of view of the author, the path. Not only not love for the motherland, but complete alienation, active hostility to its spiritual principles and not only not renunciation of political rights, but the exertion of all will and forces to influence the life of the country. Such a combination turned out to be amazingly effective: it created the "Small People", which surpassed in its effectiveness all other variants of this phenomenon that arose in History.

§ 10. CONCLUSION

We see that the current situation is rooted in the past. Terrible reminiscences of the more immediate past are superimposed on the traditions of two thousand years of isolation, they put pressure on modern consciousness, which seeks to push them out, reorient the feelings that arise on their basis. This is how that painful national complex is created, to which it is necessary, apparently, to attribute the harshest overtones in the modern literature of "Small People", irritated attacks against Russians and Russian history.

But for us - Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians - this bunch of painful questions is burning hotly up-to-date, in no way can it be reduced only to an assessment of our history. It manifests itself most tragically in the situation of young people. Finding no points of view that would help her understand the problems put forward by life, she hopes to find fresh thoughts, learn new facts - from foreign radio. Or he is trying to get a ticket to a fashionable theater with an aura of independence in order to hear the word of truth from its stage. In any case, he plays films with songs by Galich and Vysotsky. But from everywhere on her pours, imposed on her, as the only conceivable view, the same ideology of the "Small People": an arrogant, ironic, mocking attitude to everything Russian, even to Russian names; the concept - "it has always been like this in this country and there can be nothing good", the image of Russia - "perfected by long experience of the technique of brain processing, confused youth is **ABSOLUTELY UNSECURED**. For none of those who could be an authority for her will warn her that she is dealing simply with a new version of propaganda - albeit very poisonous, but resting on a more than fragile factual basis.

The ominous silhouette of the "Small People" is looming on our horizon again. It would seem that our historical experience should have developed immunity against it, sharpen our eyesight, teach us to distinguish this image - but I am afraid that it did not. And it is clear why: the link between generations was broken, the experience was not passed on from one to another. And now we are under the threat that our experience will not be known to the next generation.

Knowing the role that the "Small People" played in history, one can imagine what its new phenomenon is fraught with: so clearly proclaimed ideals are being realized - the assertion of the psychology of a "displaced person", life "without roots", "walking on water", that is ... **FINAL DESTRUCTION OF RELIGIOUS AND NATIONAL LIFE BASES**. And at the same time, at the first opportunity - recklessly decisive manipulation of the people's fate. And as a result - a new and last catastrophe, after which nothing will be left of our people. The call given at the very end of the previous paragraph sounds urgently: to make a choice between the position of foreigners without political rights and citizenship based on love for the motherland - it logically addresses the entire "Small People". Each of those whom we have quoted so many times, from Amalrik to Yanov, has the right to despise and hate Russia, but beyond that they want to determine its fate, make plans for it and are ready to take on their implementation. This combination is typical in the history of the "Small People", it is this combination that

brings him success. The isolation from the psychology of the "Big People", the inability to understand its historical experience, which in ordinary times could be perceived as primitive and inferior, in crisis situations provides an opportunity to especially boldly cut and cut its living body.

What can we counter this threat? It would seem that thoughts can be fought with thoughts, the word can be opposed by the word. However, the matter is not so simple. Already from the samples of the literature of the "Small People", which were given in our article, one can see that this literature is not at all the result of the objective work of thought, not an appeal to life experience and logic. We meet here with some other form of transmission of ideological concepts, which is inherent in all historical versions of the "Small People".

Such a very specific activity in the "direction of public opinion" took shape, apparently, already in the XVIII century. and was described by Koshen. It includes, for example, a colossal but short-term concentration of public attention on certain events or people, most often on denunciations of certain aspects of the surrounding life - from the Kalas trial, when the monstrous injustice of the sentence exposed by Voltaire shocked Europe (and about which historians assure that no there was no miscarriage of justice at all) - before the Dreyfus or Beilis case. Or fabricating and maintaining authority based solely on the power of hypnosis. "They create reputations and make you applaud boring authors and fake books, if only they are your own," says Koshen. A bad play can be made to watch with a clack. "This same klaka, delivered by "societies", so well trained that it seems sincere, so well distributed in the hall that the clerks do not know each other and often each of the spectators takes them for the public. " , the story of Raynal, the philosophy of Helvetius, this emptiness of tasteless prose, could withstand publication, find a dozen readers: and yet everyone read them, or at least bought them and talked about them. They might say - that was the fashion. Of course! But how to understand this tendency to stilt and ponderousness in the age of taste and elegance? "In the same way, the understanding of our descendants will be inaccessible to the influence of Freud as a scientist, the glory of the composer Schoenberg, the painter Picasso, the writer Kafka or the poet Brodsky ... so perfectly trained that it seems sincere, so well distributed in the hall that the clerks do not know each other and often each of the spectators takes them for the audience. " , this emptiness of tasteless prose, could withstand editions, find a dozen readers: meanwhile, everyone read them, or at least bought them and talked about them. They might say - that was the fashion. Of course! But how to understand this tendency to stilt and ponderousness in the age of taste and elegance? "In the same way, the

understanding of our descendants will be inaccessible to the influence of Freud as a scientist, the glory of the composer Schoenberg, the painter Picasso, the writer Kafka or the poet Brodsky ... that the clerks do not know each other and often each of the spectators takes them for the public. "" Now it is difficult to imagine that the moralizing of Mably, the political research of Condorcet, the story of Raynal, the philosophy of Helvetius, this emptiness of tasteless prose, could withstand publication, find a dozen readers: and yet everyone read them, or at least bought them and talked about them. They might say - that was the fashion. Of course! But how to understand this tendency to stilt and ponderousness in the age of taste and elegance? "In the same way, the understanding of our descendants will be inaccessible to the influence of Freud as a scientist, the glory of the composer Schoenberg, the painter Picasso, the writer Kafka or the poet Brodsky ... that the clerks do not know each other and often each of the spectators takes them for the public. "" Now it is difficult to imagine that the moralizing of Mably, the political research of Condorcet, the story of Raynal, the philosophy of Helvetius, this emptiness of tasteless prose, could withstand publication, find a dozen readers: and yet everyone read them, or at least bought them and talked about them. They might say - that was the fashion. Of course! But how to understand this tendency to stilt and ponderousness in the age of taste and elegance? "In the same way, the understanding of our descendants will be inaccessible to the influence of Freud as a scientist, the glory of the composer Schoenberg, the painter Picasso, the writer Kafka or the poet Brodsky ... Raynal's story, the philosophy of Helvetius, this emptiness of tasteless prose, could withstand editions, find a dozen readers: and yet everyone read them, or at least bought them and talked about them. They might say - that was the fashion. Of course! But how to understand this tendency to stilt and ponderousness in the age of taste and elegance? "In the same way, the understanding of our descendants will be inaccessible to the influence of Freud as a scientist, the glory of the composer Schoenberg, the painter Picasso, the writer Kafka or the poet Brodsky ... Raynal's story, the philosophy of Helvetius, this emptiness of tasteless prose, could withstand editions, find a dozen readers: and yet everyone read them, or at least bought them and talked about them. They might say - that was the fashion. Of course! But how to understand this tendency to stilt and ponderousness in the age of taste and elegance? "In the same way, the understanding of our descendants will be inaccessible to the influence of Freud as a scientist, the glory of the composer Schoenberg, the painter Picasso, the writer Kafka or the poet Brodsky ...

Thus, logic, facts, thoughts alone are powerless in such a situation, this confirms the entire course of History. Only the individual historical experience of the people can help here to distinguish truth from falsehood. But if anyone has such experience, then it is our people! And this, of course, is the main guarantee that we will be able to resist the new phenomenon of the "Small People". Our experience is tragic, but also the deepest, undoubtedly, it changed the deepest layers of the people's psyche. It is necessary, however, to BE AWARE of it - to clothe it in a form that is accessible not only to emotions, but also to thoughts, to develop, based on it, our attitude to the main problems of our time. It seems to me that this is precisely the main task of Russian thought today.

Therefore, we simply do not have the right to allow the just reviving craving to comprehend our national path to be trampled down, spit on, to be pushed onto the road of noisy journalistic polemics. How, then, will we protect the national consciousness and especially the consciousness of young people from the imposed complex of doom, from the instilled view that our people can only be material for other people's experiments?

For many centuries, the spiritual image of the people has been taking shape, the skills of social existence, organically connected with each other, have been developed - and only based on them, historical evolution can create stable, natural forms of life for this people. For example, the publicists of "Small People" often emphasize that a strong state has played an important role in Russian history - and in this they are apparently right. But this means that if, on their advice, suddenly completely eliminate in some way the role of the state, leaving unrestricted economic and political competition as the only forces operating in society, then the result can only be a rapid and complete collapse. The same arguments lead to the opposite conclusion: that the state, apparently, should play a large role in the life of our country for a long time to come. What specific role can only be shown by life itself. Of course, some functions of the state can be limited, transferred to other social forces. By itself, the strong influence of the state does not have to be detrimental, just as it does not have to be fruitful. The state contributed to the enslavement of the peasants in Russia in the 17th-18th centuries, but it also carried out the emancipation of the peasants in the 19th century. There are many examples of undoubtedly positive important actions carried out due to the strong influence of the state on life. For example, the labor legislation introduced in Russia at the end of the 19th - beginning of the 20th centuries was at the level of its contemporary Western, and if we compare it with the phase of the country's industrial development, it was much ahead of it, it was developed much faster. Only England and Germany had more progressive laws, in France and in the United States, the legal position of the workers was worse. The state, like other forces operating in the life of the people - parties, churches, national movements, etc. - has its own danger, the possibility of painful development (or temptation). For the state, this is an attempt to subordinate the souls of citizens to its power. But it may well remain strong by avoiding this painful path. The same picture in almost all issues - you can always find a way out that does not break with the historical tradition, and only such a path will lead to a vital, sustainable solution, since it relies on the wisdom of many centuries growing, tested, selected and polished to each other features and skills of the folk organism. Concrete awareness of this point of view is the force that we can oppose to the "Small People",

A thousand-year history has forged such traits of national character as the belief that the fate of man and the fate of the people are inseparable in their deepest layers and merge in fateful moments of history, as a connection with the Earth - the land in the narrow sense that will give birth to bread, and with the Russian land ... These traits helped to survive the terrible trials, to live and work in sometimes almost inhuman conditions. All hope for our future lies in this ancient tradition. It is for her that there is a struggle with the "Small People", whose credo Dostoevsky guessed: "Whoever cursed his past is already ours - this is our formula!"

A person is born and dies, as a rule, among his people. Therefore, his environment is perceived by him as something completely natural and usually does not raise any questions. In fact, the people are one of the most amazing phenomena and mysteries on our Earth. Why do these societies arise? What forces have supported them for centuries and millennia? Until now, all attempts to answer these questions have so clearly missed the mark that most likely we are dealing here with a phenomenon to which the standard methods of "understanding" of modern science are generally inapplicable ... It is easier to indicate why people need peoples. Belonging to one's own people makes a person a part of History, the mysteries of the past and the future. He can feel himself not just a particle of "living matter" being processed for some reason by the giant factory of Nature. He is able to feel (more often - subconsciously) the significance and higher meaningfulness of the earthly existence of mankind and his role in it. Similar to the "biological environment", the people is the "social environment" of man: a wonderful creation, supported and created by our actions, but not according to our intentions.

In many ways, it surpasses the capabilities of our understanding, but often touchingly defenseless against our thoughtless intervention. History can be viewed as a two-way process of interaction between man and his "social environment" - the people. We said that people give people. Man creates the forces that hold the people together and ensure its existence: language, folklore, art, awareness of their historical fate. When this two-sided process goes wrong, the same happens as in nature: the environment turns into a dead desert, and with it man perishes. More specifically, a person's interest in work and the fate of his country disappears, life becomes a senseless burden, young people are looking for a way out in irrational outbursts of violence, men turn into alcoholics or drug addicts, women stop giving birth, people are dying out ...

This is the end to which the "Small People" is pushing, tirelessly working to destroy everything that supports the existence of the "Big People". Therefore, the creation of a weapon of spiritual protection against it is a matter of national self-preservation. Such a task is within the power of the entire people. But there is a more modest task that we can only solve individually: TO TELL THE TRUTH, to utter, finally, fearfully silent words. I could not have died in peace without trying.

Written in 1979-1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES

To § 1

Here is a more accurate description of the works mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph. G. Pomerants. "Quadrillion", "Man from Nowhere", "Son of the Earth"; A. Amalric. "Will the Soviet Union last until 1984?" (Samizdat). "Bulletin of the Russian Student Christian Movement" (RSHD) № 97, 1970. Collection of works: "Self-consciousness", New York, 1976, and "Democratic alternatives", Germany, 1976. B. Shragin. "Confrontation of the Spirit", London, 1976. A. Yanov. "Detant after Brezhnev" [Foreign works are reproduced in Russian transcription.] (Hereinafter cited as "Razryadka") and Verasion New Wright (Hereinafter cited as "New ...") - both in the Institute of International Steadies, University of California, Berkeley, 1977. R. Pipes. "Russia ender ve old mode" (Hereinafter cited as "Russia ..."). London, 1974.

To § 2

Criticism of the concepts outlined in § 1 can be found, for example, in the works of L. Borodin. "Veche", No. 8 (Samizdat). A. Solzhenitsyn. "From under the boulders" (Samizdat) and other performances. V. Borisov and I. Dubrovsky. "Bulletin of the RSKhD", No. 125. A. Shanetsky. "Memory", No. 4 (Samizdat).

For the place of the concept of "Moscow - the Third Rome" in the worldview of the Muscovite kingdom, see, for example, D. S. Likhachev. "National Identity of Ancient Rus", from 100-101, and the works of N. N. Maslennikova and A. L. Goldberg in TODRL for 1962, 1969, 1974.

The fact that the secularization of church lands did not cause social upheaval in Russia - Pipes. "Russia ...", p. 242.

The synodal period of church management - as an example of the "Russian disposition to unanimous obedience" - Shragin. "Self-awareness", p. 263.

On the influence of the "territorial system" of church government, adopted in Protestant countries, on the church structure of Russia, see, for example, A. S. Pavlov. "The course of church law", Sergiev Posad, 1902, p. 225 - 490, 507.

About "the significance of the Nikolaev legislation for the totalitarianism of the twentieth century" - Pipes. "Russia ...", p. 291 - 295.

Quotes from the European founders of the totalitarian state theory are taken from: Thomas Hobbes. Selected works in two volumes. Volume II, M., 1965. Leviathan or Matter, Form and Power of the Church and Civil State. S. 47, 196-202, 207, 230-235, 488-490, 505, 526-527, 567. B. Spinoza. Selected works in two volumes. Volume II. Political treatise. S. 301-302, 305, 309-310. Jean-Jacques Rousseau. "On the social contract or the principle of political law". M., 1938, p. 13-14, 16, 18, 24, 29, 34.

For Western influences on Peter's legislation, see: Georgy Gurevich. "Truth of the will of the monarchs" by Feofan Prokopovich and its Western European sources. Yuriev, 1915.

On "revolutionary messianism" see: L. Talmont. "Political messianism". London, 1960.

On heretical teachings and popular social utopias in Russia, see, for example: N. A. Kazakova and Ya. S. Lurie. "Antifeudal heretical movements in Russia in the 15th - early 16th centuries". M.-L., 1955; A. Klibanov. "People's social utopia in Russia". M., 1977.

For a discussion of the "Tale of Dracula" see: V. Borisov. "Bulletin of the RSKhD", No. 125; G. Pomerants. Open letter to the editor of Vestnik RSKhD (Samizdat).

Pipes about private property in Muscovite Rus: "Russia ...", p. 316; I. Dubrovsky. "Bulletin of the RSKhD", No. 125.

Pipes about Russian proverbs: "Russia ...", p. 159. Pipes about literacy in Moscow Russia: "Russia ...", p. 123. See also A. I. Sobolevsky: "Education of Moscow Russia XV-XVII centuries.", St. Petersburg, 1892, especially p. 3-4. The calculations of AI Sobolevsky were continued by NA Vaganova: "Russian reader of the 17th century." on Sat. "Old Russian literature and its connections with modern times". M., 1967. See also DS Likhachev: "The culture of the Russian people." M.-L., 1961, p. 106-107.

Yanov on the role of the "Gulag Archipelago" in Russian history: "Democratic alternatives", p. 188.

About the Western European coups of the 20s. XIX century, very similar to the conspiracy of the Decembrists, also organized by secret societies (in Spain - by the Masons, in Italy - by the Carbonari), see, for example, E. Tarle: "Political movement in Spain and Italy in 1820-1828.", "Book for reading on the history of modern times", vol. IV, part I, p. 128-176. M., 1913.

There is an article in the Encyclopedia Britannica about the Thistelwood conspiracy or the "Conspiracy on the Rue Cato".

Herzen writes about the suppression of the June 1848 uprising. More details can be found in the book: Charles Schmidt. "June days 1848", L., 1927.

Very different figures were given regarding the number of those killed in the defeat of the Paris Commune. The conservative journalist Maxime Du Cam claims that the number of National Guards killed and executed on the barricades is 6,600 (M. Du Cam. Le Convoulson de Paris, vol. I, Paris, 1881). This figure is clearly underestimated, since even Marshal McMahon speaks of 15,000. Usually, the figure is called from 30,000 (Georges Bourgin. "History of the Commune", L., 1962) to 20,000 (E. Lissagare. "History of the Commune") ...

Yanov on the "age" of democracy: "New ...", p. 93. He is about Belinsky as a Slavophile: magazine "22", Tel Aviv, 1978, p. 36.

For Cromwell's Irish campaign, see, for example, Michael Freund. "Di grosse revolutionary in England", Hamburg, 1951. How many died as a result of the slave trade, estimates Du Bois: "Ve nigro", London, 1915. The number of victims of the French revolution from his contemporaries was estimated at a million by such a revolutionary as Gracchus Babeuf ("On the system of extermination population, or the Life and Crimes of Career ". - Gracchus Babeuf. Works. Vol. 3, M., 1977, p. 255) and revolutionary, but later departed from the revolution L. M. Prudhom in "Istoire General e Impartial ... ". From later historians I. Teng writes: "It can be assumed that in eleven departments of the West the number of those killed of all ages and both sexes is approaching half a million." See: "The Origin of Modern France", vol. IV, book. V, ch. I (there were then 83 departments in France).

For the number of victims of the oprichnina see: RG Skrynnikov, "Ivan the Terrible". M., p. 191.

Philippe Erlanger in Le Massacre de la Saint-Berthelemy gives various estimates of the number of victims of St. Bartholomew's Night. The smallest figure was named by Bossuet: 6,000, the largest - by the educator of Louis XIV. Refix: 100,000. Among his contemporaries, the future chancellor of Henry IV Sully speaks of 60,000, the historian Tu - about 10,000 in Paris and 40,000 in the provinces, the Jesuit Bonamy - 4,000 in Paris and 25,000 in the provinces, the Protestant Crespian in the Martyrologue gives the names of 15,000 killed, the historiographer of King Masson and the English archives speak of 2,000-3,000 killed in Paris and 10,000 in the provinces (pp. 193-194).

K § 3

Quotes from Gorsky: Vestnik RSKhD, no. 97, p. 61 and 34.

Quotes from Yanov: "Discharge ...", p. 11, "New ...", p. 101, 183, 104, 86, 100.

Quotes from Pomeranets that "there are no more people": from his collections "Quadrillion", "Man from Nowhere".

Pomerants about the Russian people and the Autocrat: "A Dream of Just Retribution", "Syntax", no. 6.

"Russians have no history" - see B. Shragin, "Self-Consciousness", p. 261.

Yanov on democracy and totalitarianism: "New ...", p. 88, 102, 7.

For a characterization of English parliamentarism, see: Werner Sombart. Der Proletarian Socialism, Jena, 1924; or: Hans Delbrück, Regierung und Volkswille, and also in his Wigs and Toris in Historisch Aufsetz, Berlin, 1887.

For the limitation of power, see: C. Montesquieu. "On the spirit of laws", book. II, ch. Vi. The political views of the creators of the American Constitution are vividly described in the work of Lord Acton "Political Coses of American Revolution" (Esseys in ve liberal interpretation of history ", Chicago, 1967, pp. 41-94). See also: V. Habush." Di modern Democracy, Jena, 1921, p. 51; J. H. Rendall. Wemaking of Modern Mind, New York, 1926, pp. 345-350.

In American political literature of the 18th and early 19th centuries. "democratic" form of government was opposed to "constitutional" or "free".

Plato's scheme of the degeneration of democracy into despotism: "The State", 562. His views on democracy: ibid., 557; in Aristotle: Politics, 1292a.

Burke's Views: Ed. Burke. "Reflexion he ve revolutionary in France", New York, 1961, p. 138.

From contemporary authors: F.A. Hayek. Lowe Ledgeslation and Liberty, Vol. I. Role's and Orders, London, 1973.

Views of Krasnov-Levitin and Plyushch: "Democratic Alternatives". Ivy on terrorism: "Answer TS Khodorovich", "Continent", no. 9, p. 252.

Yanov's concept: "Syntax", No. 1, magazine "22", 1978, "New ...", p. 88, "Discharge ...", p. 141.85, 80, 82, 21.

To § 4

There are two points of view on history, both of very ancient origins. Plato compares the legislator with the master. In "State" and "Laws" he logically develops a plan for building an ideal state. On the other hand, Aristotle considers the state to be a product of natural development, like a family (Politics, 1252b). J. Burchard in "The Culture of the Renaissance in Italy" believes that the view of the state as an artificial structure was characteristic of the Renaissance.

A typical understanding of the state as a "construction" is the theory of the Hobbes-Rousseau "pact". The view of the state as an "organism" has also been expressed many times, up to attempts to construct "social physiology", "social anatomy" and the application of Darwinism to social phenomena. For an overview of these views, see, for example, Menger's book: Karl Menger. "Untersuchungen uber di socialwissenschaften und der political economy", Leipzig, 1883.

In our time, the "organic" point of view is developed in Hayek's book cited above.

In general, "the organic concept, as a rule, is closer to historians, and the" mechanical "- to sociologists and politicians" (cf. at least the modern term "social engineering").

On the role of the intelligentsia: Gorsky. "Bulletin of the RSKhD", No. 97, p. 52, 53; Shragin. "In Search of Soil" (Samizdat) and "Confrontation of the Spirit", p. 216; Pomerants. "Quadrillion" and "A Man from Nowhere".

Shragin against democracy: "Syntax", no. 3, p. 22.

A summary of the main points of Cochin is contained in a small booklet: Augustin Cochin. "Le siècle de la démocratie", Paris, 1921. A detailed exposition based on a huge amount of factual material - in the book "Le siècle de la révolution en Bretagne" (1788-89) ", Paris, 1925. Second volume is devoted exclusively to the publication of documents. The concept of Koshen did not receive (as, indeed, one would expect, in view of its "illiberality") the recognition of the majority of historians [It seems that the attitude towards him has changed now. Note 1990]. the type of revolution as a "conspiracy", which, it seems to me, presents them in a completely distorted form.

There is a classic work on the influence of Calvinism on the creation of the "spirit of capitalism": Max Weber. "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism", London, 1905.

An interesting book is devoted to the influence on the creation of the spirit of modern party life: Michael Walzer, "The Revolution of the Site", Cambridge, Mass, 1965.

For the role of the Puritans in the English Revolution, see: Belok, Hillair. "Cromwell", London, 1934 and the book by M. Freund cited above.

A characterization of German radicalism: Sombart's book cited above, vol. I, p. 45-47; and especially G. von Treitschke. "Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert", part III, ch. 9, Leipzig, 1895.

Russian journalism of the 60-70s. XIX century. see: V.A.Zaitsev. "Selected Works", vol. I, M., 1934, p. 55, 62, 95, 96; Yu. V. Steklov, "Chernyshevsky", M.-L ., 1928, part I, p. 158.

Dostoevsky F. M. "The Diary of a Writer", March 1876., May-June 1877, August 1880, January 1881

L. Tikhomirov. "Beginnings and ends ("liberals" and "terrorists")", M., 1890

To § 5

The expression "the devil of Russian tyranny" belongs to Yanov: "Syntax", No. 6.

Shragin about "Russia as the gendarme of Europe". "Self-awareness", p. 56.

For the self-esteem of the pre-revolutionary intelligentsia, see: V. Zernov. "Russian Religious Revival of the 20th Century", Paris, 1974; Vekhi (Collection of Articles on the

Russian Intelligentsia), 2nd ed., Moscow, 1909; "Intelligentsia in Russia", St. Petersburg, 1910.

To § 6

For the quotes "They are about us" see the articles "Gorsky (pseudonym) in Vestnik RSKhD", No. 97, "Dreams of the Earth" by Pomerants, "Will the Soviet Union Exist until 1984?" . 60; Pipes, "Russia ...", p. 97, Yanova, "New ...", p. 141 and "Razryadka ...", p. 87, album "Le Painted Ruse Contemporary", Palais de Congress, Paris, 1976, painting "Ciel Lourdes", article by Meerson-Aksenov in "Self-Consciousness", p. 103 and Amalric in "Syntax", no. 3, p. 72.

Nationally colored quotes from Yanov see, "Discharge ...", p. IX, "New ...", p. 12-16, 31, 160, 177-180, 28, 177. Magazine "22", Tel Aviv, 1978.

N. Ya. Mandelstam that "Jews are the intelligentsia": "The second book of memoirs", Paris, 1972, p. 119, 567-568. Similar thoughts of Khazanov: Boris Khazanov. "The Smell of the Stars", Tel Aviv, p. 291, 284, 295, 278.

Shragin on the "national stock" of the intelligentsia: "Confrontation of the Spirit", p. thirty.

Yanov on the desirability of a "new Baruch": "Discharge ...", p. 89. Pomerants about the mission of Israel: "Dreams of the Earth" (Samizdat).

To § 7

"The revolution was not made by the Jews alone" - "Bulletin of the RSKhD", no. 97, p. 6.

The play "The Burnt Sun" - "Time and We", Tel Aviv, 1980, no. 7.

Pomerants on the "accursed question": "A dream of just retribution", "Syntax", no. 6.

Collection of articles "Russia and the Jews", republished in Paris in 1978. See also: F. Svetov. "Open the doors for me", Paris, 1978; articles by Bergman and Don-Levin in the magazine "22" Tel Aviv, 1978; article by A. Sukonnik in the "Bulletin of the RSHD"; No. 123; Pomerants: on the "dangerous word" "Dream of just retribution", "Syntax", no. 6; A. Yanov, accusation of anti-Semitism as an atomic bomb "Syntax", no. 6; an excerpt from Sinyavsky's article in Continent No. 1, dealing with "Russian anti-Semitism", has been translated in We New York of Bouquet. April 15, 1976; another article by the same author on the same topic: "Syntax", no. 2, 1978, p. 48.

To § 8

"Russia and the Jews", article by I. O. Levin, p. 109 and I.M.Bekerman, p. 22-23. For an overview of the revolutionary emigration from Russia, see: Chronicle of the Socialist

Movement in Russia in 1878-1887. "Publication of materials of the Ministry of Internal Affairs". M., 1907, p. 325-333. Azev's testimony in: "Byloe", No. 1, July, 1917.

Extensive statistics are found in the book: A. Wild. "Jews in Russia and the USSR", New York, 1967. The book contains inaccuracies, but not tendentious: on the whole, the picture outlined there, apparently, corresponds to reality.

Shulgin's story about his impressions of the civil war is in his book "What we don't like about them", Paris, 1929. Recently, a book by two journalists dedicated to the execution of the royal family was published in the West: A. Summers and T. Mangold. "Ve File of ve tsar", 1976. In particular, see p. 88 and p. 185-187 "Unpublished Notes of L. Tikhomirov", "Red Archive", v. 29, 1928. The list of the leadership of the OGPU - NKVD - in the book by R. Conquest "Great Terror".

Speeches against "great-power chauvinism" - see the materials of the XII Congress of the RCP (b) April 17-25, 1923. Speeches by Zinoviev, and Bukharin, p. 553-557, 562-566. The term "Rusotyap" is in the same place, in the reports of Ordzhonikidze (p. 159), Skrypnik (p. 526), Ordzhonikidze (p. 544).

See Bezymensky's poem in the almanac "30 days", 1925, No. 9, others - "Pravda" on August 13, 1925. and the same almanac "30 days", 1930, no. 8.

Ivy about Kutuzov as a "reactionary", see "Democratic Alternatives", "Conversations with Leonid Plyushch".

For a biography of Trotsky, describing his national feelings, see: Joel Carmichael. "Trotsky", Jerusalem, 1980. (Abridged translation from English).

The views of Chaim Zhitlovsky and Charles Rappoport: the magazine "Time and We", Tel Aviv, 1976, no. 11.

On Azev and the Socialist-Revolutionaries in general, see: B. Nikolaevsky. "Azev Ve Spai", N.Y., 1934, p. 69, 88.

M.N. Pokrovsky. "Essays on the history of the revolutionary movement in Russia in the 19th and 20th centuries." M., 1924, p. 152. Gr. S. Yu. Witte. "Memories", vol. I, L., 1924, p. 360. Shulgin's addition "What we don't like about them". Shulgin cites B'nai Brit News, XII, no. 9.

An account of Loeb's speech is published, for example, in the Philadelphia Press, 19, II, 1912.

To § 9

Max Weber on the history of the "Jewish ghetto", see: M. Weber. "Gezamelte Aufsetze zur Religionsociology", Bd. III. "Das Antique Judentum", Tübingen, 1923, p. 434-435.

The prayer that Brod leads, see: M. Brod. "Johannes Reuchlin und Zein Kampf", Stuttgart - Berlin - Cologne - Mainz, 1965, p. 263. Brod says that he saw this prayer in his mother's prayer book.

Lassalle's thoughts: F. Lassalle. "Diary", P., 1919, p. 119. Martova: Yu. Martov. "Notes of a Social Democrat", "Nov", M., 1924, p. 23.

For poetry of Bialik, see: H. Bialik. "Songs and Poems". Translated by B. Zhabotinsky, 2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1912, p. 85, 119, 171, 191.

An article from an Israeli magazine: Shmuel Mushnik. "Menorah", No. 22, VIII edition, Jerusalem, 1980; from Canadian: Gindin. "Contemporary", No. 34, Toronto, 1978, p. 209.

Quotes from the book "Russia and the Jews", p. 132, 117, 228.

To § 10

Regarding the labor legislation in Russia at the end of the XIX century. see: V.P. Litvinov-Falinsky. "Factory legislation and factory inspection in Russia", ed. II. SPb., 1904; P. A. Khromov. "Economic development of Russia in the XIX-XX centuries", M., 1950, p. 350-354.

The general atmosphere of government measures in the work question before the world war is characterized by the "Conclusion of an interdepartmental conference on the search for measures against strikes", "Red Archive", No. 34, 1929.

RUSOPHOBIA: TEN YEARS LATER

In recent years, we have become witnesses and participants in an amazing phenomenon, for which I, at least, do not see any precedents in history. The Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Brezhnev system was a ruthless and inhuman reinforced concrete monolith. His only absolute principle was the preservation of power at any cost. And suddenly it crumbled for no apparent reason: a lost war, strikes, unrest or hunger. Under this system, on holidays, typewriters were sealed in institutions to prevent leaflets from being printed, and patrols were appointed to catch non-existent intruders. And the same system, without resistance, renounced domination over the economy, censorship, fake elections, allowed parties and media hostile to it. This was not a slow evolution, but an instant (on a historical scale) collapse. He turned our whole life and views upside down. The relative weight of different factors, their relationship with each other - everything has become different.

In view of this, I return to the theme of my old work - "RUSOPHOBIA". It was written more than ten years ago, during the period of undivided (and, as it seemed, almost eternal) domination of the regime. It never occurred to me that the work could be printed during my lifetime. After much hesitation, my friends and I decided to distribute it in samizdat, hoping that out of dozens of copies, at least a few would survive and convey this testimony of our time to our descendants.

Life turned out to be full of surprises. Firstly, even then, in 1982, the work began to spread in Samizdat quite briskly. And then "perestroika" and "glasnost" began, the work was published, and not only by one edition, [Veche (Munich). 1988. "Kuban". 1989. Nos. 5, 6, 7, "Our Contemporary", 1989, Nos. 6 and 11 and a number of separate editions.] Has even been translated into several languages. As a result, there were many responses to it, printed, read on the radio or in letters to the author. These responses also provide material for the analysis of the phenomenon considered in the work.

For the convenience of the reader, I will give a brief summary of the main provisions of "Russophobia".

1. In our journalism and literature there is a very influential trend that instills the concept of inferiority and inferiority of Russian history, culture, national psyche: "Russia is a hotbed of totalitarianism, Russians had no history, Russians always grovel before strong power." The term "Russophobia" is used to denote this trend. It is mortally dangerous for the Russian people, depriving them of faith in their own strength.

2. Russophobia is the ideology of a certain social stratum that constitutes a minority and opposes itself to the rest of the people. His ideology includes the confidence of this layer in its right to create the fate of the entire people, which is assigned the role of material in the hands of the master. It is argued that the historical tradition and national point of view should be completely ignored, we must build our life on the basis of the norms of Western European, and especially American society.

3. A similar narrow stratum, hostile to the historical traditions of the rest of the people and convinced of their right to manipulate their fate, arose in many situations. It was very vividly described by the French historian O. Koshen in connection with the Great French Revolution. Koshen called it "Small People" (opposing the rest - "Big People"). The same term is used in the work for all variants of this phenomenon. Other phenomena include the English Revolution (Puritans), Germany in the 1930s. XIX century ("Young Germany", "Young Hegelians"), Russia during the "revolutionary situation" - 70s. XIX century.

4. In the literature of the modern "Small People" it is striking what an exceptional role the Jewish national problems play. This, like a number of other signs, indicates that it has an influential nucleus associated with some current of Jewish nationalism. The situation is dramatized by the reminiscences of the role that the radical Jewry movement played in the preparation, implementation and consolidation of the revolution. Nevertheless, the "Small People" is by no means a national trend: representatives of different nations (as well as social strata) participate in it. In the same way, our revolution was by no means "made by the Jews": the process began in an era when there could be no question of any Jewish influence.

The complete replacement of all the foundations and bonds of our life has led to the fact that the influence on the life of the phenomena considered in the work has become completely different. There was an opportunity to look at them in a new way, and to check again the conclusions of the work.

1. RUSOPHOBIA TODAY

In my old work, I was forced to reconstruct, guess the phenomenon that I dubbed Russophobia, according to individual articles of samizdat, according to emigre publications. Now, with full publicity, with the merger of our and the emigrant book markets, such difficulties do not exist. And the current, which then could only be guessed at that it would have an impact on life in the future, is now becoming a powerful and obvious force. In new conditions, the phenomenon itself becomes new. Here's an example to get you started:

The lackey laughs, the slave laughs, The
executioner sharpens his ax, The
tyrant torments the capon,
The winter moon shines.
That kind of fatherland: engraving,
On a bed of a soldier and a fool.
The old woman scratches her dead side.
That is a kind of fatherland: splint.
The dog barks, the wind carries,
Boris asks Gleb in the face,
Couples are spinning at the ball,
In the hallway there is a pile on the floor.
The moon shines, tormenting eyesight,
Under it - like a separate brain - a cloud.
Let the artist, the parasite, will
depict another landscape.

I could probably quote this 10 years ago as well. But then - what was significant in this? In his antipathies, a person is not free, and the form of their expression is just a personal feature of the author. But now we hear from all sides that the author, I. Brodsky, is the greatest Russian poet of our time, deservedly crowned with the Nobel Prize, and his poems are returning to their homeland (although the applicability of such a term here is perhaps doubtful). The social significance of this work has become completely different.

Here's an example from prose. "In this country goats with plucked sides graze, scabrous inhabitants timidly make their way along the fences. (...) In this country there were twelve million prisoners, each had his own informer, therefore, twelve million traitors lived in it. This is the same country, which in slavery the Heavenly King went out, blessing "; "I am used to being ashamed of this homeland, where every day is humiliation, every meeting is like a slap in the face, where everything - the landscape and people - offends the eye." It was written in the 70s, but I don't even know if it was published then. Now it is distributed in large circulation ("Library" Ogonyok "). The author B. Khazanov (G. Faibisovich) publishes (together with K. Lyubarsky and E. Finkelstein) in the Federal Republic of Germany the magazine "Country and World ", oriented in the spirit of the above quotations.

This is the "wind of change". In particular, almost everything that I quoted in an old work from sam- and tamizdat has now flooded here in massive circulations. With the cancellation of the silencer, Radio Liberty can be heard 24 hours a day anywhere - all of its broadcasting is heated with this passion. Russians ("Russian chauvinism") are the culprits of the famine in Ukraine, Russian consciousness is basically utopian, Russians are not adults at all. And until the complete loss of decency, undisguised delight about all the troubles of our country: devastation, civil strife, imminent famine.

Newspapers, magazines, television are increasingly subject to this trend. The well-known shout from the very top of the government - that we live poorly, since the Russians are lazy - was taken up with sympathy. For example, the journal "Science and Technology" - where is the place of ideology? But: "The development of cooperatives will increase property inequality. One person is talented and hardworking, the other is lazy. So it was, is and will be until laziness disappears - one of the traits of the Russian character." The national distribution of this inequality of property is already predetermined here. Another option: "There is no doubt that serfdom could not develop slavish character traits in the serf." Maybe we can check with Pushkin? Here is a typical serf - Savelich. But the author who does not agree with Pushkin consoles us, pointing out hope for the future: "After all, the children of former serfs took part in the All-Russian political strike of 1905. How psychology has changed in 44 years! "This is horror, in an era of such a darkening of reason we live! To consider as slaves those who created our fairy tales and songs, who stood to death near Poltava and Borodino! And free souls - those who followed the semi-literate, evil, morally flawed screamers who brought them - now everyone can see where." One of his correspondents wrote to Pobedonostsev in the 70s, how a "nihilist" agitated a peasant: take an ax, and everything that is noble today will be yours tomorrow. in response: and the day after tomorrow? And he explains: if I am not a thief, not a murderer, I will go to rob and kill, so why can't you take the loot from me? half a century ahead, I saw what which Herzen, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Mikhailovsky, Milyukov did not suspect. But all the same - "slave".

For a more convincing proof of this thesis, another author asks: why not the "godless West," but Russia, allowed the "beating of the church by the state? How deeply the religious people allowed the physical extermination of 320 thousand servicemen in one year of Soviet power (1919) (see. "Komsomolskaya Pravda" dated September 12, 1989)". Tolstoy magazine ("October") writes about one of the greatest tragedies of our history with feuilleton shamelessness. 300 thousand - this is the approximate number of all clergy - white and black - before the revolution. And, of course, it was not all exterminated in one year, it was exterminated for another 20 years. Indeed, by the beginning of the war (1941) of this number, hardly one twentieth part served, but the rest are far from all and not even the majority. were "physically exterminated". If we compare it with the West, in the 1920s, the persecution of the Catholic Church in Mexico was no softer than ours. The priest, caught performing the requiem, was shot, and imprisoned for the cross. The peasants who rose to defend their faith were hanged, shot, and locked up in concentration camps. The organizers were Americanized businessmen and lawyers, funded from the States, the American attaché gave advice

on the implementation of the "scorched earth" policy and the creation of concentration camps (the Americans already had experience in Hawaii). The West not only allowed the peasants to be crushed, but the free press also silenced this whole drama - so that few people know about it. (Now the vivid novel by G. Green "Power and Glory" about this persecution and Green's travel notes "The Roads of Iniquity" have been translated. But the strongest impression is from the dry story of a historian, for example, J.

Another author, and completely without facts, is even more frank: "The Russian national character has degenerated. To revive it means to doom the country to lag again." The third has even more trenchant: "The status of nonexistence of all Russian life, in which time does not exist." "Russia must be destroyed. In the sense that the enchantment must be dispelled, It seems to have been destroyed, but Kashchey's egg is intact." And already completely breaking down: "The country of fools ... is now ... in a state of a bastard society." About the Russians: "What to do with them? It's hard to believe in retraining this people to live for life (this is the language of the original!). In sealing? In scattering around the world? In complete extermination? Not a single correct answer." And thanks for that!

It seems that the existence of the Russian people is an annoying, annoying nuisance. Comes to something fantastic! The Literaturnaya Gazeta published a letter from the famous artist of the Taganka Theater V. Zolotukhin. Earlier, this newspaper wrote about the "disgusting spectacle" in which he participated, quoting some words "about the purity of blood" (pronounced in a place where Zolotukhin was not). The actor began to receive letters accusing him of being unprincipled, that he is an "enemy of the Jewish people." The same letters were hung out in the theater. For what? It turns out that on the 60th anniversary of Shukshin, in his homeland, Zolotukhin said - we have a living Shukshin, Astafiev, Rasputin, Belov live, and we will not let us block the Katun with a dam! If it hadn't been printed, I wouldn't have believed it!

One or another assessment of Russia, of the Russian people is always associated with an assessment of its culture, especially literature. And here is a similar picture, For example, "Walking with Pushkin" by Sinyavsky, I mentioned in passing in my old work, then it was a small scandal in the emigre environment. [I would like to take this opportunity to correct a mistake made in my previous work. Sinyavsky was sentenced not to 5 years, but to 7 years, of which he served 6.] Now "Walks" are published here in a large-circulation magazine. No matter how you explain their origin: the desire to sting Russian culture, the pathological ambivalent love-hate attitude towards Pushkin, the desire for fame through scandal - the reader still has the feeling that something painful and unclean is connected with the image of the one who still illuminates our spiritual life. The article about these "During his walks, Solzhenitsyn drew attention to signs of the same "rethinking" of Gogol, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Lermontov, and suggested that a broad concept is not being laid here - just as Russia had no history, so there was no literature? in the local magazine we meet: "Here in Gogol's melancholy, after a few lines, turns into heroism, as in Pushkin's - revelry into melancholy. So they poured, eerily to say, from empty to empty, from expanse to desolation - throughout the proud Russian thought. " : "Oh, my Rus, my wife! .." The turn came to Solzhenitsyn.

Sinyavsky, his co-editor for the magazine Rozanov, Sarnov, V. Belotserkovsky and many of them are busy with this business. Recently, in the round table of the journal Foreign Literature, many serious reproaches were expressed to writers that they are afraid (of whom or what is it interesting?) To explain Solzhenitsyn's mediocrity and reactionary character. But earlier, Voinovich had already distinguished himself with a whole novel - a dirty libel against Solzhenitsyn. "Clouding of reason", "the fifth column of Soviet propaganda", "preaching about Great Russian nationalism" and "Black Hundred insinuations" - this is V. Belotserkovsky about Solzhenitsyn, in the same spirit as the old denunciations of Bil-Belotserkovsky about Bulgakov! And other contemporaries did not pass. "The main thing is in Astafyev's worldview, the main feature of which, in my opinion, is shamelessness." "Primitive, animal chauvinism, elementary ignorance "(about him)." The obscurantism of the Rasputins ... ". "Belov lies ... ". "Lad "- a lie." So: from Pushkin to the present day. [It is felt that Blok is missing here. At the last moment I found about him too. One author in the émigré magazine Grani affectionately explains what we owe to I. Brodsky. It turns out that the author never liked Blok, but he was ashamed of it. But Brodsky, in a conversation with Solomon Volkov ("Continent" 6, No. 53), boldly said: "For example, I don't like Blok now passively, but before - actively (...) for bad taste. In my opinion, this is a person and the poet is extremely vile in many ways. " And thus he removed the heavy burden from the author's soul.] The broader literature is language. From a very recent (by the way, we have not yet met Turgenev, so he came in handy). "In days of doubt,

The most typical story in this stream of literature by V. Grossman "Everything flows". If 10 years ago I casually mentioned it as a little-known work, but the forerunner of the whole direction, now it is widely published and supported by the publication of the previously unknown bright novel by Grossman "Life and Fate", and especially his colossal advertising. The scheme of the story: the hero, leaving the camp, tries to understand what happened to him and the country. Is Stalin guilty? - no, he comes to the conclusion that many of the repulsive features go back to Lenin. So Lenin? No, the hero goes deeper. At the end of the book, he sets out his final understanding. The reason is in the "Russian soul", the "thousand-year-old slave". "The development of the West was fertilized by the growth of freedom, and the development of Russia - by the growth of slavery." A hundred years ago, the idea of freedom was brought to Russia from the West, but it was destroyed by the Russian "serf, slavish principle. Like aqua regia smoking from its own strength, it dissolved the metal and salt of human dignity." And in other countries slavery sometimes triumphed - but under the influence of the Russian example. "Is the Russian soul still mysterious? No, there is no mystery. And was there any? What is the mystery in slavery?" The story seems to describe the peasants with sympathy, starving to death during collectivization. But in the end, the reader understands: it was their own slave soul that starved them to death, and even imposed slavery outside their country. This concept of deep denial of Russia and its entire history had come across to me only once before - in the main ideological work of National Socialism - Rosenberg's Myth of the 20th Century. There is the same scheme of Russian history. Russians are inferior, natural slaves. Their state was created by the Varangian Germans. But they gradually dissolved, lost their racial purity. The result is the Mongol conquest. The second time the Germans created the Russian state and

culture in the post-Petrine era, and again they were overwhelmed by a racially inferior element. Rosenberg's concept is more consistent, since it clearly formulates a practical goal: a new conquest of Russia and German domination, insured this time from the dissolution of the superior race by an inferior people! and again they were overwhelmed by the racially inferior element. Rosenberg's concept is more consistent, since it clearly formulates a practical goal: a new conquest of Russia and German domination, insured this time from the dissolution of the superior race by an inferior people! and again they were overwhelmed by the racially inferior element. Rosenberg's concept is more consistent, since it clearly formulates a practical goal: a new conquest of Russia and German domination, insured this time from the dissolution of the superior race by an inferior people!

Grossman's story leads to the most pressing issue, the comprehension of the revolution and the ensuing chain of tragedies. Even 10 years ago, the question seemed only a topic for the reasoning of ideologists, but now it is facing everyone. And the answer sounds, which has long been prepared, but is now being introduced by the power of the media: the reason is in the Russian tradition, Russian history, Russian national character (like Grossman).

Here Russia appears even as an evil force that ruined Western (Marxist?) Ideas (dissolved, "like royal vodka" according to Grossman), "the idea of socialism, which came to us from the West, fell on a dull soil crushed by centuries-old traditions of slavery." Russia "discredited the very ideas of socialism." It is not for nothing that the system that has arisen in our country is sometimes called "socialism" (in quotation marks), then pseudo-socialism. "Do the prison organization of production and life, alienation, and serfdom in the countryside fit in with socialism?" Why don't they fit? Our system coincides to paradoxical details with the pictures of the future socialist society, no matter who draws them. Even the sending of townspeople to the village for the harvest was provided for - this is how the "classics" imagined "

More specifically, they are looking for the reason in the peasant. "The idea of collectivization was somewhat reminiscent (to the peasants - I.Sh.) of a well-known and close collectivity." "The predisposition of the pre-bourgeois peasantry to collective farming". "Most of the peasants have come to terms with collectivization." How do you know that they are reconciled? Just because Rybakov did not want to describe how this "reconciliation" resulted in thousands of uprisings, pacified by machine guns? Among our supportive philosophers, A. Tsipko, it seems, was the first to dare to recall the Marxist foundation of the revolution (although, it is true, we have been told about this with different accents for decades). He even seems to be polemicizing with the previous author: "the now fashionable myth about the peasant origin of Stalin's leftist leaps, including collectivization" - and indicates the identity of the ideology of Stalin, Lenin and other Marxists, up to Marx. But he is very concerned that "the wave of renewal ... is associated with our main shrines - with October, socialism, Marxism." As a result, "the origins of Stalinism are in the traditions of Russian left radicalism." But if Stalin thought according to Marx? Then in what traditions did Marxism originate? Recently, the same author wrote in a newspaper: "The catastrophe that occurred in 1917 was

enthusiastically received by the entire people." And the four years of the civil war, the Antonovskoye, West Siberian, Izhevskoye, Tula, Vologda uprisings? The famous zemstvo S.S. Maslov wrote in the early 1920s: "The peasantry is fighting tirelessly and fiercely.

But the Russians remain guilty for all authors, a criminal people. "The inability of the Russian nation to revise the past and admit its guilt ..." "Only an equal economic community of peoples can remove the suspicion of superiority from the Russian people" (such is the syllable!). That is, Russians are viewed as an amnestied criminal who still has to prove by good behavior that he has corrected himself.

It would seem that at least the victory in the last war, bought even by the uncountable lives of the Russians and saved the entire democratic world, could cause condescension to the Russians. But no, it's easier to change your attitude towards Hitler. "Russia taught the world pure forms of totalitarian power," and "modern political science considers even fascist Germany not to be a purely totalitarian, authoritarian-totalitarian state." You are too late, critics of Russia! You should appear in 1942 and explain that there is a war of totalitarian power against just an authoritarian-totalitarian state. There would be an interested audience for a lively discussion - even all over the world.

The whole mood is not new - and in my old work I gave many such examples. But now it is already closely linked with reality. "The retort of slavery" - Russia - naturally, must be destroyed, so that it does not rise. During the First World War, the dark adventurer Parvus-Gelfand presented the German General Staff with a plan for a bloodless victory over Russia. He offered not stingy to finance revolutionaries (Bolsheviks, Left Socialist-Revolutionaries) and any groups of nationalists in order to cause a social revolution and the disintegration of Russia into small states. The plan began to be successfully implemented (the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk), but the defeat of Germany in the West prevented. Similar ideas were discussed by Hitler. But now such plans are being developed and promoted in our country. Divide the country into parts according to the number of peoples, that is, into 100 parts, grant sovereignty to any territory " And this is logical: since the people who created this state are "slaves", since "Russia must be destroyed," then such an end is the only reasonable way out. All objections are "imperial thinking", "imperial ambitions". And inspired by such an ideology, politicians inflate separatist passions behind each other's backs like saboteurs blowing up a house behind enemy lines. What 10 years ago was an ideological structure has now become a powerful, physical destructive force. And this is logical: since the people who created this state are "slaves", since "Russia must be destroyed," then such an end is the only reasonable way out. All objections are "imperial thinking", "imperial ambitions". And inspired by such an ideology, politicians inflate separatist passions behind each other's backs like saboteurs blowing up a house behind enemy lines. What 10 years ago was an ideological structure has now become a powerful, physical destructive force. blowing up a house behind enemy lines. What 10 years ago was an ideological structure has now become a powerful, physical destructive force. blowing up a house behind enemy

lines. What 10 years ago was an ideological structure has now become a powerful, physical destructive force.

In my previous work, I drew attention to the concept of the emigrant Sovietologist A. Yanov: Russia cannot work out a plan for its development on its own, the "Western intellectual community" must do it for it. Yanov compares this task to the one that faced the advisers of General MacArthur, the commander of the American army of occupation in Japan after the end of World War II. Then this idea seemed to me characteristic as a symbol, a sign that Russophobic authors already think within the framework of the concept of occupation. But now the former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR E. Shevardnadze is quite businesslike declaring that he has a positive attitude to the participation of UN troops in resolving conflicts within the USSR (Pravda, 21.IV.91).

Against the gloomy background of our life, there is, however, something positive: a series of dramatic events provides material for comparing them with some of the ideas discussed above - an opportunity for experimental verification has appeared. For example, such a central concept for the entire current as "Russian fascism". "The Russian idea is being realized as fascism," "Russians are racists." The village writers are often chosen as the spokesmen for the tendencies of the whole people. Village writers are racists, a favorite topic for Radio Liberty. "Are Belov and Astafiev nationalists?" - asks Pomerantz. "For them, a Muscovite is a stranger, almost a foreigner; a woman who is fond of aerobics is a whore. Nonsense, but he answers the consciousness of several tens of millions, ripped out of the village and shoved into large-block and large-panel structures. "" There is no soil, but there is a movement of new barbarians, internal "coming Huns." Another author: "The morality that Astafyev carries is a mixture brought to an anecdote, but typical for the entire movement: declared love - and realized hatred." In Russia they call a person of a non-Russian type, and even more so a Caucasian one, whether he is a huckster or not a huckster, it does not matter; and they also call them "chuchmek" and "chok" if he looks like he is from Central Asia. " we could see how the Russian fascists persecute and smash the "Chuchmeks". But here he complains " Russophone "(Russian-speaking) from Chisinau:" In my entrance it is written in large: ingots, go home. Chushki is a street synonym for a Russophone. "It was not the Russians who chanted in Kishinev:" Chushki, hold your rally in Siberia, "and someone else beat a Russian young man to death for speaking Russian on the street. "Migrants, get out of Lithuania," and it was the Estonian people's deputy who wrote that the Russians descended from women raped by the Tatars. Azerbaijanis and Armenians, Georgians and Abkhazians, Georgians and Ossetians are killing each other, Uzbeks are smashing Meskhs, but you cannot hear anyone it was the Russians who killed, but the pogroms of the Russians were in Alma-Ata, Dushanbe, Tuva. And refugees of all nationalities flock to Russia, especially to Moscow. What Russian properties are manifested here? Refugees themselves go to Moscow - what to do with them? But it's not always so peaceful. For example, when in 1921 hungry refugees from Russia poured into Georgia, the question of closing the border was raised there. Probably, in recent years, there have been such clashes where the initiators were the Russians, but the general nature of the events, it seems, does not

in any way correspond to the image of "Russian fascists". The concept of "Russian fascism" has passed the first experimental test ...

B. Khazanov writes: "Beware when you are told about love for your homeland: this love is infected with hatred. Beware when cries of Russophobia are created: they want to tell you that the Russian people are surrounded by enemies." But let's hear another point of view! This was written by Rozanov in 1914, when our 74-year-old experiment was still in preparation: "It was not at all about 'Slavophilism and Westernism.' , which was indicated by a number of famous writers to be understood as the worst enemy of some enlightenment and culture, and there was a case of Christianity and the Church, which were indicated to be understood as a barrier of darkness, darkness and ignorance; the barrier and - in its essence - the error of history, superstition, relic, then , which is not (...).

Russia does not contain any healthy and valuable link. Russia, in fact, no, it seems. This is a terrible phantom, a terrible nightmare that crushes the soul of all enlightened people. From this nightmare we flee abroad, emigrate, and if we agree to leave ourselves in Russia, then for the sake of the only thing that we are in full confidence that soon this phantom will not be, and we will scatter it, and for this scattering we remain on this damned place of Eastern Europe. Our people are only a "means", "material", "substance" for the adoption of a single and universal and final truth, which is collectively called "European civilization". No "Russian civilization", no "Russian culture" ... But there was no further agreement, and a hysteria of swearing began. Thought about "

II. "LITTLE PEOPLE" TODAY

A distinctive feature of the "Small People" in all historical situations is its very special attitude towards the rest of the people, as if towards beings of a different, lower nature. And now the left-wing radical politician says: "They live like a pig, and what is most terrible, they are happy with it." The economist advises buying "them" for a billion of cheap consumer goods - for several years "they" will be satisfied. Only an Englishman could say that about blacks - and even then in the last century. The authors clearly feel themselves not inside, but outside this people. Here is a perfectly clear wording: "Two peoples are stretching to opposite poles in order to grapple once again. the Slavophiles and with them the whole immense Russia - beggar, hungry, but still seeing deliverance from all troubles only in a "firm hand", in a "master", in noose and prison and the icon-leader. The other people are extremely small in number. He sees deliverance in the destruction of the power of the bureaucracy, in a free and democratic state. "[It is amazing! If we proceed from the concept of democracy, the power of the majority (the author is a democrat deputy), then the conclusion is unequivocal: it is necessary to return" the power of a firm hand, "the" master, " prison and the icon of the leader. After all, this is the will of the majority!]

The worldview of this trend is not burdened with unnecessary complications: neither Hegelian phraseology, nor reasoning about the transformation of nails into a frock coat, nor calls to "storm the sky" or a picture of a leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom. It can be called "the ideology of the bicycle", because it is perfectly expressed by a simple and cheerful appeal: "Let's not reinvent the wheel!" It is assumed that somewhere a simple scheme is already ready, following which we need to mount our life. Any of them would probably be deeply offended if their spiritual life was compared in complexity to the construction of a bicycle. But the problems of a huge country, inhabited by a hundred peoples, with a history stretching back thousands of years, with a multifaceted culture, they call to interpret at such a level.

People with such views in our country usually call themselves "leftists". This is a very old term, in all cases it defines a well-defined type. So Trotsky was to the left of Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin, then Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev were to the left of Stalin and Bukharin, and, finally, Stalin was to the left of Bukharin. Before the revolution the Social-Democrats were on the left, but among them the Bolsheviks were more to the left than the Mensheviks. The Socialist-Revolutionaries were also leftists, but among them the Bolsheviks' allies in the October Revolution were called "leftists". The term "left" consistently characterizes a certain attitude in life. Language is not a "sign system" where any concept can be designated by any sign: there is a deep connection between the concept and the word expressing it. Regarding the word "left," Dal quotes the expressions: "I stepped out of bed with my left foot," "leftism: not true, The Latin word sinister means left, spoiled, unhappy, pernicious, evil, spiteful. The Slavic, Germanic and Lithuanian terms correspond to the Latin laevus, which means left, awkward, stupid, sinister. It is said about the Son of Man: "And he will set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left" (Matt. 25, 33). For many primitive peoples, a fundamental role is played by the opposition of rows: day, sun, right, straight ... - night,

moon, left, crooked ... The Latin word sinister means left, spoiled, unhappy, pernicious, evil, spiteful. The Slavic, Germanic and Lithuanian terms correspond to the Latin laevus, which means left, awkward, stupid, sinister. It is said about the Son of Man: "And he will set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left" (Matt. 25, 33). For many primitive peoples, a fundamental role is played by the opposition of rows: day, sun, right, straight ... - night, moon, left, crooked ...

Before the revolution, our "Small People" (or one could say "Left People") was not unambiguously partisan. It filled the top of the left-wing parties, but to a large extent it was also non-partisan. After the revolution, everything changed: one part of him entered the ruling party, the other submitted to it as "sympathizers" and "fellow travelers", the rest were thrown out of life. So, in a frostbitten form, the ideology of the "Small People" and was carried in the body of the party through the decades, until it came to life again. Therefore, the modern "Small People" was born out of the party and is associated with it by a commonality of many basic features. They are related by alienation from the people and the attitude towards it as a "means" and "material". Lenin explained to Gorky his view of the "muzhik" (80 percent of the population): "Well, in your opinion, millions of men with rifles in their hands - not a threat to culture, no? Do you think the Constituent Assembly would have dealt with their anarchism? You who are so many - and rightly so! - Make noise about the anarchism of the countryside, you ought to understand our work better than others. "This also includes the image of Russia as a smut "that can ignite the world. And Bukharin - both who proposed to remake humanity with the help of executions, and in his mildest period - proceeded from the fact that the peasantry must be guided, transformed, led by them, denying them the right to develop in accordance with their own traditions and views. Stalinist collectivization was not an ideological problem for the party, but tactics - that is why it was so easily accepted by the party. , Brezhnev or Andropov, speaking of "our state", have always counted its history from the 17th year. And before that there was something "not ours" for them. I have kept Brezhnev's answer to congratulations on his 70th birthday published in Pravda. There is not only a hint of the 1000-year history of the state in which he rules, but not even a word about this state in general - everything is only about the party and Lenin, as if he were a stranger in this country, a foreign conqueror. The ideology of the "Small People" and the party is united in the conviction that the culprit of all failures is the people. In Solzhenitsyn, Stalin complains: "The people loved him, that's true, but the people themselves were swarming with very many shortcomings, the people themselves were no good." And now our economy is in crisis, because the people are lazy. For the same reason, pop artists, especially lovingly depicting the image of an alcoholic fool among the people, were highly valued by the party leaders and were crowned with the highest awards.

But when the "people" was perceived not as the entire population, but as a certain nation, then they were Russians, a national personification, the archetype of an abstract "people". In Trotsky: their main feature is "herdness," Lenin's characteristic: the people are "great only by their violence, great as the Derzhimorda is great," and so on up to the Stalinist formula of the history of Russia, which consisted, "among other things, that its they beat all the time ... ". In this regard, A.N. Yakovlev expressed a fundamental party

tradition in his article *Against Antihistoricism* (1972), a signal to defeat a group of writers suspected of Russian patriotism. It is logical to meet in it the thesis that the "good guy" should have been "destroyed". And in exactly the same spirit in the article "The Syndrome of the Enemy" (1990), he sketches out his scheme of Russian history ("Let's take at least Russia"): "Whoever she fought with." "All this forms consciousness, remains in the gene pool." "Psychologically - an aggravating legacy." How can a people with a burdened gene pool live: after all, genes are not re-educated? (One consolation that we know from the school: the acquired traits do not affect the gene pool!) This is how the ideology of the "Small People" and the ruling party stratum merge.

The unity of ideology is the reason for the loyal love of the modern "Small People" for the revolutionary past and its heroes: "the stormy, almost brilliant Trotsky" or Bukharin - "a man who rejects evil" (as one newspaper called him). Especially by the 20s - the era when the leap to the village was being prepared, a layer of people was brought up for whom the entire village way of life was disgusting and was subject to destruction. There is a hope that the unfinished business will then be completed now: "It's the twenties. Not at first, but from the end." We are offered to regard the leaders of that era as romantics - perhaps misguided - in contrast to the monster Stalin. Indeed, those people experienced a certain upsurge, a surge of energy: this can be called romanticism, it can be called obsession. But romance gave the same boost. "Nordic race"! It would seem that one measure should be applied to those who were tried in Nuremberg and to those who destroyed the Cossacks. Or is the extermination of men just a mistake of romantics? dear memories. "Not a step back from 1937!" was then the slogan of the day. "Why do we need to equate Stalin's criminality and immorality with the hopelessness (?) of revolutionaries? "To sow doubts in souls about the correctness of the socialist choice." This was written not in an orthodox party newspaper, but in the most popular left-wing edition. that he wants to rehabilitate Stalin by this. And when I supported and developed his idea, then my note was balanced by an article by R. Medvedev, where he exposed a terrible secret that I want to cast a shadow on the slogan "more socialism!" (which they all then repeated). My old work "Rearguard Battles of Marxism" was reprinted here when all leftist ideologists were still fighting these battles with courage. There are many similar examples. It was we, the "conservatives," who gradually forced the left movement to abandon that phraseology of "Lenin's behests", "socialist ideals" and even, in part, Marxism, which many of them now pathetically stigmatize. when all leftist ideologists were still fighting these battles with courage. There are many similar examples. It was we, the "conservatives," who gradually forced the left movement to abandon that phraseology of "Lenin's behests", "socialist ideals" and even, in part, Marxism, which many of them now pathetically stigmatize. when all leftist ideologists were still fighting these battles with courage. There are many similar examples. It was we, the "conservatives," who gradually forced the left movement to abandon that phraseology of "Lenin's behests", "socialist ideals" and even, in part, Marxism, which many of them now pathetically stigmatize.

Yes, the connection between the "Small People" and the party ruling stratum is also visible at the personal level. Who are their leaders today: political leaders,

ideologists? These are yesterday's leaders of the party apparatus (up to very high ones), economists-specialists in the analysis of developed socialism, ideologists, philosophers, even investigators, KGB generals, ministers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs! Almost all of them were members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union 1-2 years ago: "commutants", in the words of B. Oleinik. Among them there is almost no one who would have opposed this ruling stratum yesterday. Of those who fought against the transfer of rivers and the poisoning of Lake Baikal, no one was among the left-wing leaders. Even members of the dissident human rights movement, despite the similarity of many views, are very poorly received by this stratum. Sakharov was a rare exception, they should have taken care of him like the apple of their eye,

The transition from orthodox communist to leftist phraseology often happens almost instantly, which would be almost impossible if there was no ideological unity. Thus, V. Grossman wrote: "The Party, its Central Committee, commissars of divisions and regiments, political instructors of companies and platoons, ordinary communists in these battles organized the fighting and moral strength of the Red Army." In the war, in his opinion, "the winners were the workers and peasants who became the rulers of Russia." He even signed a letter to Stalin demanding the most severe punishment for the "murderous doctors." (See Semyon Lipkin. "Time and Fates". M., 1990).

The unity is so strong that one side feels painful when the other is touched. Thus, the recent Komsomol and now independent Leningrad newspaper Smena, having devoted a whole page to criticizing my views, highlighted in bold letters the words associated with the statement (in my interview published earlier by the same newspaper) that it is not a personal confrontation between Yeltsin and Gorbachev, but simply - that we will not have effective leadership as long as it is in the hands of representatives of the former party elite. The unity is also reflected in the ease with which the "left" appeals to the apparatus of power: the court, the KGB - although theoretically they have severely condemned it. A paradoxical example - G. Pomerantsev so refutes my opinion that the ideology of "Memory" and the Baltic "fronts" coincide: "True, it is officially known that

The peculiarity of the modern "Small People" is that it is not the first time in our history that it is one of the decisive forces. Apparently, in this regard, for him such a painful role is played by the problem of historical responsibility, guilt. How strange! From this layer, we often hear that the search for the "guilty", the "enemy syndrome" are signs of a flawed consciousness. It is explained to us that those who have been knocked out of life, destabilized people and whole strata of the people are inclined to look for "scapegoats" anywhere. But surprisingly, we immediately hear that the bearers of Stalinism are the lower strata of the people ("Stalinism, so to speak, mass, grassroots"), the social base of Stalin was the patriarchal peasantry, now the nursery of totalitarian ideology is the ruined peasantry ("new Huns"), in the revolution the people are to blame, the Russians. But all these groups are also "someone" - and why is it permissible to make them "scapegoats"? Why is this not a sign of a flawed consciousness? Recently, a paradoxical article by a KGB officer appeared, where the author, complaining that his department has become a "whipping boy", urges not to look for the guilty, but to admit that "the whole nation" is guilty. Here, the lack of logic is striking, as is the goal - to stop

talking on an unpleasant topic. But in other cases, the situation is no different. that "the whole nation" is guilty. Here, the lack of logic is striking, as is the goal - to stop talking on an unpleasant topic. But in other cases, the situation is no different. that "the whole nation" is guilty. Here, the lack of logic is striking, as is the goal - to stop talking on an unpleasant topic. But in other cases, the situation is no different.

But the problem of "historical responsibility" is very deep and important - and what a pity that it turned into a soccer ball that is being thrown from one to the other! It all comes down to just calling the "guilty" —the patriarchal peasantry, the Freemasons, the national traits of Russians or Jews. But first it would be necessary to discuss the very formulation of the question.

Speaking about the guilt of the people, we use the analogy between people and people, since usually the concept of guilt is applied only to a person. Such analogies are often productive for asking questions, but dangerous as a method for finding answers. It all depends on how far the analogy goes! You can really give many arguments in favor of the fact that the people are something alive. Even spiritualized, as it is capable of creativity - for example, folklore. But at the same time it is an "organism", which is much more inherent in unconscious creativity than the logical development of solutions to achieve the formulated goal. Only consideration of a multitude of historical situations could clarify to what extent the concept of "guilt" is characteristic of such an "organism". In our revolution, one phase is very clearly distinguished, conditionally - "arose Soviet Hungary and the Soviet Republic in Bavaria, communist parties arose in all countries. Western public opinion for the most part welcomed the "brilliant experiment." An essential role was played by the persistent hostility of the West towards historical Russia, the money of the German General Staff, and a powerful influx of forces of radical Jewry into the revolution. All these external factors must be discarded, considering the problem of "Russian guilt." Is there anything left after that? Feeling tells me - yes! That history is not a process "beyond good and evil", where it is meaningless to ask a question about wine, how meaningless (according to LN Gumilyov's favorite comparison) to ask who is right: an alkali or an acid in a chemical reaction. There is a problem of choice, in the solution of which a moral mistake is possible, influencing the entire following history - what Dostoevsky called "mistakes of the heart." To highlight this factor (or to make sure that it does not exist) would be very important for realizing our destiny.

III. "LITTLE PEOPLE" READS "RUSOPHOBIA"

I never expected that the reaction to my work "RUSOPHOBIA" would reach such a size: only individual articles devoted to it (in our country and in the West) I know of more than 30. Moreover, there are numerous passages about it in articles devoted to it in radio broadcasts. letters. Critical articles, letters and broadcasts come mainly from the very stratum that I have called the "Small People". Outwardly differing - from correct to grossly abusive, different levels of culture and even literacy, they are based on a very uniform worldview. It would be a shame not to use such abundant information about this layer. It is tempting to try to understand more clearly the phenomenon of Russophobia with the help of responses to "RUSOPHOBIA".

Russophobia as an experience, a feeling is especially clearly manifested in letters. "The alcohol-obedient majority", "the revolution, conceived as liberation, like true socialism, degenerated on Russian soil due to a number of national characteristics", "people rebelling for a 6- or 8-pointed cross or because of the way the name of the idol is spelled "(a hint of a schism, one of the reasons for which was the change in the spelling of the name of Jesus. So the" idol "is Christ, the feeling is serious!). Here are some characteristics from only one letter: "a narcissistic fool: we are on a woe to all bourgeois!", "A millennium of dictatorships has undermined the intellectual and moral potential of the masses," bomb ", " the hero of folklore Ivanushka - is there any other nation that still has a moron? " in America. The oldest known version dates back to 492 and is contained in the Chinese collection Po-yu-king, translated from Indian. " his view, he was known to him in advance and the facts had to confirm it - otherwise, what are these facts! on the Cape Verde Islands, in America. The oldest known version dates back to 492 and is contained in the Chinese collection Po-yu-king, translated from Indian. " his opinion, he was known to him in advance and the facts had to confirm it - otherwise, what are these facts! on the Cape Verde Islands, in America. The oldest known version dates back to 492 and is contained in the Chinese collection Po-yu-king, translated from Indian. " his opinion, he was known to him in advance and the facts had to confirm it - otherwise, what are these facts!

The concept of the "Small People" is also expressed very clearly. One correspondent writes that he even likes the concept, but it must be supplemented with one sentence: "It's very simple. They are smarter than others." Let's compare with the thought of the previous author about the moron people. How will "smart people" lead him along the path of progress? After all, he does not understand elementary logic; other means are needed here. (So the author is already sending a complaint against me to the ideological commission of the Central Committee - it was written back in 1989)

In critical articles I was struck by some kind of abyss of mutual misunderstanding, my arguments are simply not perceived by critics, our reasoning moves in different, non-intersecting spaces. Moreover, it seems to me that only in some cases this is a deliberate disregard for what has been said as a polemical device.

An example of such a mysterious misunderstanding is the discussion (by many authors) of the very phenomenon of Russophobia. There is a standard set of quotes from article to article, in letters, in notes after speeches. These are the words from Pushkin's letter about himself: "I fled to Paris and will never return to accursed Russia - ay-yes, clever", the dying entry in Blok's diary: "Russia ate me like a pig of a stupid pig", "Farewell, unwashed Russia "Lermontova," The courts are full of black lies "Khomyakova, Chaadaev, Gogol. The authors find it deadly to ask: "Won't you enroll them all as Russophobes?" Every time it seems that the questioners, if they wanted, could understand and answer themselves - and if there is a desire not to understand, then any references are superfluous.

It mixes excerpts from a personal letter and diary entries with articles and books. But who will judge, for example, the attitude of a husband to his wife according to the words escaped during a quarrel? Once, in connection with the scandal caused by Sinyavsky's publications, and in particular by "Russia-Bitch", in defense of him, they recalled that Blok also called Russia a pig. In a letter to the Parisian "Russian Thought" one author from the USSR who did not disclose his name then drew attention to the fact that Blok wrote this in his diary, and Sinyavsky in the magazine "Continent"; Blok is in Russia, dying of hunger, and Sinyavsky is in Paris, by no means starving. And Blok, calling Russia a pig, also called himself a pig, and Sinyavsky, who wrote "Russia is a Mother, Russia is a Bitch," did not want to draw from this the conclusion that suggests itself about him.

Love for "unwashed Russia" is even more striking. Lermontov's authorship has been questioned more than once, the poem is first mentioned 30 years after his death, there is no autograph. In some pre-revolutionary editions it was printed in the "attributed" section. In any case, he should not have been involved in characterizing Lermontov's attitude to Russia, which is so different in his other works. (For comparison - Pushkin's poetic arrangement of "Our Father": "Father of men, Heavenly Father ..." is not mentioned at all in the latest editions of his works). Recently I looked through a number of literature textbooks for all grades: "Unwashed Russia" is repeated twice - if the student has forgotten, so that in a few years he will remember. What reflects such a voluptuous craving for this poem, if not Russophobia?

Of course, there was also such a mysterious phenomenon as Chaadaev, who was friends with Pushkin and wrote: "We gave nothing to the world," "We did not take the trouble to create anything in the field of imagination." But it was even brighter, Pecherin: "how sweet it is to hate the motherland! And eagerly await its destruction." What does this prove? Only the existence of Russophobia (for Chaadaev - as one of the components of his mysterious worldview). So that's what the article is about.

Of course, there are phenomena that have common external features, although they are completely different. But the difference is felt right away! When Gogol read "Dead Souls" to Pushkin, he at first laughed, then became more and more sad and exclaimed: "God, how sad is our Russia!" But could anyone say that "Russia is sad" when reading Voinovich's novel, where our descendants in the 21st century eat processed feces; this

"secondary product" is handed over to reception centers, and those who have fulfilled the norm receive the right to indulge in masturbation in a special closet. Gogol feels horror at the sinfulness of man, for him, of course, the Russian man. This is a "criticism of man", going deep into his spiritual essence, but based not only on sympathy, but on a sense of unity with him. Voinovich's novel contains, in fact, only superficial, albeit unscrupulous, curses, meaningless, like curses shouted by a drunk or written on a fence. There is clearly no place for sympathy: the author describes the whole situation, laughing cheerfully, and perhaps even gloatingly.

The phenomenon of the "Small People" that seemed to me so curious did not arouse any interest at all, nor any attempts at principled discussion. And I was so struck by the uniformity of all historical realizations of this phenomenon! When our publicists argued that there was no literature at all in Russia, Pushkin and Lermontov were mediocrity, the whole culture was among the Germans, the Germans wrote the same about their literature, about Goethe, and they saw culture only in France, and the French in England. But I only met an objection about the details. The most common is that it is implausible that the minority could impose its will on the majority, that such a thought is even offensive to the "Big People". Of course, if we were talking about a purely physical collision, so to speak "wall to wall", this would be a convincing argument. But the "Small People" acts through ideology, the media or underground parties - it is not the numerical ratio that decides. After all, it is not surprising that, for example, the absence of vitamin B <MV] 12, which is only 1-2 millionths of a gram in the body, causes pernicious anemia and death, or that barely visible bacilli kill a large animal - is this "offensive" fact for an animal? In the early 80s. of the last century, the police department compiled a list of all revolutionaries known to him. It included a really overwhelming number of participants in the revolutionary movement, and in total there were 151 people on the list, this is a quarter of a century before the revolution! Stalin showed his most vivid misunderstanding of this side of life when, in response to a comment about the role of the Pope, he asked ironically: "How many divisions can he deploy?" In addition, the area of activity "

Sometimes my critics in their views are further from each other than I am from each of them. So the concept of "Small people" is given two diametrically opposite interpretations. One is that it is any minority. For example, the staff philosopher of Radio Liberty B. Paramonov reminds that the apostles were a minority, and invites me, as a Christian to a Christian, to think about it. But the "Small People" is a minority that seeks to maintain its isolation among the rest of the people, seeing in this the way to subjugate the majority to its will. The apostles were bequeathed to preach their faith to all nations - that is, <B] to cease to be a minority! For some reason, this obvious-ridiculous objection is repeated by many critics. The opposite interpretation, on the contrary, is extremely narrowed down that the "Small people" - these are only Jews. For example, Sinyavsky more than once expounds my work in this way: "The small (Jewish) people, it turns out, have been waging a long-standing mortal struggle with the big (Russian) people." What does this have to do with my views, if as an example of the "Small People" I cite in my work the Puritans during the English Revolution, while the Jews were expelled from England in the 13th century, and they were prohibited from entering there under fear of

death? As applied to the modern "Small People", I analyze this issue in detail ("Our Contemporary, 1989, No. 6, p. 189 and No. 11, p. 165) and give a number of considerations why the identification of "Small people" - Jews, in my look, is incorrect. Here is a case that cannot be attributed to a conscientious misunderstanding. The same statement is contained in a letter signed by the 31st author ("for whom conscientious attitude towards the analyzed source should be a professional habit. One consolation is to hope that both of them signed the letter without reading it, relying on the authors. for whom conscientious attitude towards the analyzed source should be a professional habit. One consolation is to hope that both of them signed the letter without reading it, relying on the authors.

Many objections remained just incomprehensible to me, no matter how hard I tried. For example, the same philosopher from "Svoboda" B. Paramonov reproaches that I am "kind" to the idea of the organic nature of society - from his point of view, "society cannot be understood by analogy with nature," since there is no freedom in nature. But if Paramonov has a dog, then he must see how she constantly manifests freedom - for example, running away from the owner after the oncoming cat. It was the view of nature as something low, inanimate that gave rise to the concept of "conquering nature", the confidence in the right to do whatever one wants with it - that is, the ecological crisis that threatens the destruction of nature and a person who has forgotten that he is a part of it. Meanwhile, I liked the argument so much that it migrated to several of our articles. But B. Paramonov is frightening and more terrible: "Organic societies are stagnant societies." However, first of all, Nature is organic, and in it, as B. Paramonov knows, not stagnation, but evolution occurs. For 4 billion years before us there was no life on earth, for 2 million there was no man, and more recently - B. Paramonov himself. And there is no certainty that nature has exhausted its creative powers on it - as one of the heroes of Conan Doyle said, perhaps she is preparing even bigger surprises for us.

Apparently, as my critics do not understand me, so I am not able to understand them. Including criticism using Christian vocabulary. For example, in connection with the quotes from the Old Testament that jarring criticism. Well, Christians should manipulate quotations from Scripture, as Marxists do with their "classics"? If the Bible says that King David put the defeated under the saws, then you can try to understand for yourself what is the place of these and other episodes from the Old Testament in the Christian worldview, you can, at worst, admit that this is incomprehensible to us now, but it is shameful to pretend, as if it doesn't exist. What can we say about the article, full of texts from Scripture, where I am caught in a thirst for reprisals, hatred, that I interfere in the Divine House-building, displeased with God, spiritually rejected Christianity, despised the Gospel commandments, I wear the mask of inquisitors, the secret of which is "We are with him." "He is Satan, taking the form of an" Angel of Light. "In conclusion, the author meekly reminds that" Christians are called not to curse. "(One of Walter Scott's characters said about the Puritans: they will hang you without hesitation, but to calm their conscience, will accompany it with some text like "Here Phineas rebelled and brought judgment").

It amazes me that the authors remain silent precisely about the issues in which they are competent. For example, Sinyavsky disagrees with me that Russians and Ukrainians are depicted in Babel's Cavalry as being of a lower type. No, he says, rather heroic people. But I have, for example, a quote: "And monstrous Russia, incredible, like a herd of body lice ..." Sinyavsky says that he worked a lot with Babel: here it would be better to explain what is in this image "more heroic." And just about this he is silent, although wherever he wrote and did not speak about "Russophobia".

Or B. Khazanov expressed a very interesting thought, which I quote in my work: "By replacing the vacuum that formed after the disappearance of the Russian intelligentsia, the Jews themselves became this intelligentsia." After all, the intelligentsia can be compared with the nervous system of the people. What kind of an unusual creature did it turn out, whose nervous system and body are made of different ethnic materials? Khazanov dedicated a special article to "Russophobia", where he compares me with Hitler, and Rosenberg, and Streicher - but he does not comment on this interesting idea.

Or else: regarding Solzhenitsyn's phrase "the Cheka apparatus abounded in Latvians, Poles, Jews, Magyars, Chinese", Pomerantz accuses the author that he "thrust a dangerous word in the middle so that it could not be pulled out for quotation." In "Russophobia" I express my bewilderment, why is this word "dangerous" in the middle, and not all the others? But the hope of getting an answer was in vain: Pomerantz spoke out many times about "Russophobia", but he talked about anything, just not about this phrase of his, the meaning of which he could reveal to us. What a pity!

When it became clear that reviews would appear on the work, I began to read them with great interest, hoping to meet a discussion on the merits, even if the authors did not completely agree with me. But the result is complete disappointment. Often I could not understand what is the attitude of the authors to the main provisions of the article (for example, how they are formulated at the beginning of this work). Even if we admit all the objections - about nature, and about Babel, and about the Holy Scriptures, etc. - it still remains, for example, incomprehensible: does the author consider Russophobia to be a real, significant factor in our life? Is there such a phenomenon "Small people"? The impression from these critics was different: they strive to instill that the work should not be read, but if someone has read it, it is better to forget it as soon as possible. And besides that, in a number of cases, hostility towards the surrounding people is visible,

The polemical techniques used in the discussion give a special shade to the entire discussion. For example, Pomerantz writes: "Now a few words about polemic tricks. This is also, by the way, a trait of unfree consciousness. I. Shafarevich (...) declares himself a person far from" Memory "(poor, slandered" Memory ") - and ends article a triangular hallelujah in her honor. " After reading it, I gasped - where did it come from? But the author gives an exact quote: "I believe in the enormous power of memory: in the fact that every nation ... and even all living organisms ... they all keep memory in themselves ..." ... "And Pushkin, it turns out, secretly sympathized with" Memory "! Ah, these were careless words about "polemical cunning" and "unfree consciousness."

Another example. I receive a letter signed by Alexei Shmelev with a number of questions about "Russophobia". Including - where are the quotes from the Talmud taken from. Answered, citing my sources (including a recent book by a professor at the University of Tel Aviv Y. Katz), even advising in which library these books can be found. I receive a letter with gratitude for the "clear and precise answer". Suddenly in the magazine "Banner" I come across an article by the same Alexei Shmelev "According to the laws of parody? (I. Shafarevich and his "Russophobia")". The author quotes M. Agursky's words about another article of a completely different person (pseudonym), that there "quotations filled with distortions (...) are borrowed from anti-Semitic literature of the pre-revolutionary period, like the books of A. Shmakov, I. Lyutostansky, etc." ... And further: "Didn't Shafarevich use the same original? Or did he discover some new data? .. "Alas, these data are known not only to me, but also to Shmelev. (And then, referring to Shmelev, the Kazan newspaper Nauka publishes an article: "How Shafarevich perverted the sources.") What already here to appeal to the Holy Scripture and Christian values: even the average Hottentot will not go to such tricks!

And another example. I had an evening at Moscow State University in October 1989, and a few days later the Svoboda station broadcast a message about him: "from our Moscow correspondent Mark Deutsch." Everyone who came to the evening could not fit in the hall, and the organizers radioed the hall. Mark Deutsch said that there were very few people, and it is not surprising, since self-respecting people would not have gone to a meeting with the author of "Russophobia" (how kind to the hundreds of those present!). The evening lasted three and a half hours until I answered all the questions. Mark Deutsch reported that, having replied to several notes, I said I was tired and would like to end the evening, etc. The bewilderment remains: whether this is the moral and professional level of Mark Deutsch himself or the style of Radio Liberty ? What can and can anything be believed in the broadcasts of this radio station?

The publicist B. Sarnov writes: "I am not capable of polemicizing, say, with Shafarevich in a gentlemanly, parliamentary style." Unfortunately, he is far from alone. Here are some characteristics given to me and my work: a fascist, a complete Nazi, a comparison with Hitler-Rosenberg-Streicher (for edification, it is mentioned that the latter were hanged), publication of a work in the Federal Republic of Germany is a criminal act, persecution mania, innuendo, paranoid delusion, inquisitor, merged into one heap with Nina Andreeva and goes with her on different roads to the same cliff, "fanatical book", "nationalist tumor". "The book does not deserve polemics", "there is nothing to talk about", Sinyavsky suggests about the work "not to scold, not to get angry, not to read lectures, but to laugh" - but neither he himself, no other authors explicitly followed the advice. On the other hand, Novy Mir received a letter in which the author was indignant that the magazine published my article (completely different): "The point here is not in the content of the article, but in the name of the author". Developing this line of pluralism, B. Sarnov demanded that the KGB take over my work. In the newspaper "Soviet Circus" an essay by a professional esthete about "Russophobia" is illustrated by a face with bulging eyes and a protruding tongue. In the Smena newspaper, the publication of articles criticizing my interview with the same newspaper

is accompanied by an editorial introduction containing curses that I had previously heard only from drunks, did not consider them possible in the press ... Paramonov, a philosopher, published an essay with obscene (or obscene?) a name denoting a substance, previously referred exclusively to the management of sewers. Throughout his philosophical and sewage research, he merrily bathes, walks and dives in "substance".

Then I heard (about a miracle!) A bad smell,
As if a rotten egg had broken,
Ile the quarantine guard smoked with a brazier of sulfur.
I pinched my nose and turned my face away.
But the wise leader dragged me far, far away -
And, lifting the stone by the copper ring,
We went down - and I saw myself in the basement.

IV. "ANTISEMITISM"

Unfortunately, what was discussed above is only a small part of what has been written about Russophobia. Dominated by both the volume and the strength of passion is the experience of judgments about the Jewish trend in the modern "Small People". The rest is relegated to the background as an insignificant trifle: the fate of Russia, the tragedy of a people standing between being and non-being under the weight of incessant pressure on its national consciousness. Even the title of the work itself should indicate that it is devoted to the Russian theme, but this is almost completely ignored.

As one would expect, one cry, "anti-Semitism!", Dominates, drowning out the timid voice of reason. Already in "Russophobia" I expressed my opinion about this term: it is deliberately left undeciphered, amorphous. This is a signal that, in addition to logic, should act on emotions, arouse aggression. This is the tried and tested method of controlling the mass consciousness. It is amazing that the question asked in the old work - what is it, "anti-Semitism"? - EVERYONE WITHOUT EXCEPTION is not noticed by the critics I know. None of them tried to explain what he means: actions that harm people just because they are Jews? Propaganda of discrimination or violence against Jews? Expression of contempt for Jews as a nation: typical features of appearance or behavior? And there are also a lot of possible interpretations. Even the author reporting

Our generation, it would seem, could feel the uncleanness of such propaganda methods. Everyone came across a cliché that was completely identical in spirit, in logical structure and social function: "anti-Sovietism." Both of these clichés are, I think, products of the same type of consciousness. It would seem that now is the time to be ashamed, as something dirty and shameful, such techniques, smelling of the 70th and 58th articles, and the "law" of 1918 against "anti-Semitic and pogrom agitation": outlaw (?).

Articles of the Criminal Code concerning "anti-Soviet agitation" were aimed at preserving the regime and power of the ruling elite. But this could not be said so nakedly, and the "state", "the Soviet people" and even "progressive mankind" were used. Likewise, the cliché of "anti-Semitism" is intended to impose a ban on the discussion of the actions of some narrow stratum of the "Small People". In order to erase this side from consciousness, it is suggested that we are talking about some (albeit undeciphered) threat to the entire Jewish people. In particular, all the critics of my work seem to go blind, reaching those places where the conviction is expressed and argued that some very specific current of Jewish nationalism is at work in the modern "Small People".

How much easier, without bothering with argumentation, to build a chain: anti-Semitism - fascism - 6 million Jews killed by the Nazis (Sinyavsky, to be convincing, - 6 million killed in Auschwitz!). This technique is used constantly. One "criticism" is titled "Ordinary Fascism". At the end, the author (all the same B. Khazanov) writes: "The entire composition of the ideas of Academician Shafarevich from beginning to end reproduces the notorious" worldview "(Weltanschauung) of the Hitlerite guard and, in essence,

betrays him as a complete Nazi. All this has already happened - and we know well how it ended. " All this really happened, and only two years earlier, in the same magazine. This is how it sounded: "Somewhere it was already - the assertion of" national revival "through the hatred of enemies, active searches for these enemies in a very definite direction - among the Jews, of course. The memory deceived ... "The following quote follows:" Yes, of course, this is from Adolf Hitler's "Mein Kampf." , and his co-editor Lyubarsky. So what kind of psychology is this: if you just don't like it, this is a fascist repeating Hitler. (Exactly as they wrote here in the 30s!) to some Jewish groups and trends, you get a very motley list: John the Evangelist, Cicero, Tacitus, John Chrysostom, Savonarola, Luther, Shakespeare, Peter the Great, Voltaire, Derzhavin, Napoleon, Fourier, Wagner, Dostoevsky, Rozanov, Blok and many others. Hitler on this list, of course, should also be, but it occupies a very special place. However, Lenin will also be there, and even Jews such as Marx and Otto Weininger. People are so diverse that their presence in the neighborhood does not seem to mean anything.

The events of recent years, and especially the almost unlimited publicity, once again showed the national orientation of our "Small People". As in other issues, life has brought obvious clarity where previously it was necessary to operate with guesses and circumstantial evidence. In recent years, the country has been shaken by a chain of bloody ethnic clashes. Now blood is being shed all the time, many hundreds of thousands have become refugees. Here you can clearly see: which people are more threatened, make more sacrifices? How did the mass media (in their overwhelming majority) and the left leaders who support them (and supported by them) assess the situation? Whom did they consider in need of special protection: Armenians (Sumgait), Russians (Alma-Ata, Dushanbe, Tuva), Meskhovs, Ossetians? An untrained reader would not believe: we heard only one demand - the law against anti-Semitism. Articles were published about this, letters to the editorial office, petitions of deputies were submitted, while there were no real grounds for this. On the other hand, there were grounds created by the media: letters from the Pamyat militants were printed with the threat of bloody reprisals against the editor of a progressive magazine (but when we all shuddered with horror, it turned out that the author of the letters was a provocateur who wanted to compromise Pamyat), anonymous letters to deaths of the intimidated victims of persecution (although in other cases the use of anonymous letters is considered unworthy), the publication of secret instructions of "Memory" with calls for reprisals, rumors of impending brutal pogroms. They have already been announced more than once: on the occasion of the 1000th anniversary of the baptism of Rus', and on the day of St. George, May 6, 1990. And here's the paradox:

The consciousness of the West is under the same strong pressure. An example is a letter from Academician Gol'dansky published in 1990. in the Washington Post. Title: "Anti-Semitism: The Return of the Russian Nightmare". It is argued that we have emerged "evil anti-Semitic groups", flourishing "in an atmosphere of anger, envy, scapegoat and hatred," they "have now become the most powerful and certainly the fastest growing forces of schism, pushing the country to bloodshed and civil war ". The author calls them "monarch-fascists". They strive to "finish what Hitler began," they "meet with sympathy and connivance on the part of prominent leaders of the party and

government of the USSR." The pogrom is scheduled for May 6, 1990, and the assembly has already been attacked. "

The culmination, but almost caricature, was the "incident" or "sabbath" at the Central House of Writers. At the meeting of a group of writers in the House of Writers, a company of people who were not known by whom came to pass. Posters appeared, of which the most criminal was: "Zionists, get out to Israel!" (nonsense: the Zionists are exactly those who go to Israel). During the expulsion of the arrivals, a scuffle arose, someone's glasses were broken. The storm that broke out can only be compared with the "campaigns" of the old days, like "Free Angela Davis!" Excited TV appearances: MPs, writers, columnists, a stream of articles. Yes, and they wrote to me: "How else can you doubt the possibility of pogroms, when the first has already taken place in the Central House of Writers?" The main figure in the "incident" - Ostashvili - was put on trial. The investigation file consisted of 11 volumes. Ostashvili's statements, as deliberately loud and harsh, were broadcast on television and were accompanied by angry comments ... Now let's compare this with the persecution of Russians in Tuva. This was not about the letters of the provocateur or about meaningless slogans: by the middle of the summer of 1990, the number of Russians killed exceeded 50. articles, no television comments, no debates in the Supreme Soviet, no deputy commissions.

Here is a statistical description of five events - the clashes in Sumgait, Dushanbe, Tuva, Namangan and the "incident in the Central House of Writers". The number of victims (killed) and the number of lines given to this event in articles dedicated to it in such a typical publication for our press as Literaturnaya Gazeta are given:

	The number of victims	Number of lines
Sumgait	32	0
Dushanbe	24	726
Tuva	more than 80	0
Namangan	5	309
CDL	0	1131

[The number of victims in Tuva according to the Stolitsa magazine (1991, No. 4,). According to other sources - about 10.] This is the portrait of our media.

" **Antisovetism** " was a warning shot, a ban on the discussion of ideas objectionable to the ruling elite of the Leninist-Stalinist-Brezhnev regime. " **Antisemitizm** " plays the same role for the modern "small people", and often in issues that do not have any national-Jewish aspect at all. For example, the accusation of anti-Semitism can be heard against a writer who too clearly gave his sympathies to the village, or an artist whose paintings have too many crosses and temples. Recently, "Jewish newspaper" (May 7, 1991) published a list entitled "Anti-Semitic editions", which contains magazines, it seems, at all - neither "pro" nor "anti" - not dealing with Jewish problems (like "Moscow").

Such an "intellectual execution" is a powerful tool, but still it cannot have a decisive effect until it is backed up by some more material measures. The issues facing the Russian people are too burning and important to be banned without resorting to something like the White Sea Canal. The normal spiritual life of the people requires that their problems be freely discussed: not by half hints, without apologies, constant assurances that, although we are Russians, we are not racists. In short, it is equal to the problems of other peoples. And then, for example, A. Shmelev, agreeing with my opinion on the "prohibition" of discussing a number of Russian-Jewish problems, writes: "After National Socialism, dispassionately discuss how beneficial or harmful living together with Jews is did not offer.), it is difficult. "However, he does not reveal similar" difficulties "in connection with the Russians after decossackization and collectivization!

In a number of publications, a critical article on "Russophobia" by B. Kushner was published and read more than once on Svoboda. She stands out from the crowd for her sincerity. I am able, if not to agree with the author, then to understand his emotions. He writes: "Let me tell you, dear Igor Rostislavovich, that we feel pain as much as you do, we love our children just as much and it is just as hard for us to see how nails are hammered into their eye sockets, how hard it would be (don't let God!) See you in relation to your children. " These are the words that I would like to repeat in addressing the circle whose views the author expresses. Finally, believe that we are in as much pain as you are, and we have the same right to speak about our pain! We had the same Catastrophe as yours, and it lasted 25 years. There was a famine in Ukraine, which took away the wrong 5 in a year, or 7 million (they cannot be counted). During the war, the population of Belarus decreased by 1/4 and recovered only in 40 years. And you can read about the same tortures that you are writing about without any "would", for example, in materials about the activities of the Kiev Cheka. The author says: "Well, in a certain recent period of Russian history, one can indeed observe a disproportionate (both quantitatively and emotionally) participation of Jews. This circumstance seems to me tragic for my people as much as for yours." Is it really "THE SAME"? During this period, the Jews got rid of the Pale of Settlement, the percentage rate, moved from townships to cities - mostly large, many times ahead of other peoples of the USSR in terms of education and academic degrees. The Russian nobility and clergy were destroyed, the village was destroyed, the birth rate fell catastrophically. It is the Russian, and not the Jewish people who are now facing the threat of death. The author writes: "Now is the time for our national separation", obviously implying the emigration of Jews. But the Russians have no other homeland other than their ruined

country. Does this situation reflect "THE SAME MEASURE"? Such cold detachment from other people's troubles can lead very far. B. Kushner says about "Russophobia": "It seems that the notorious Christian babies are about to appear" (alluding to ritual murders). Ozhegova's "Dictionary of the Russian Language" explains the word "notorious" as follows: "widely known, but dubious or deserving of negative evaluation." But the babies killed were real, whatever the reason for their death (for example, in the Beilis case, in the processes described by Dahl). Why should they be so disdainfully treated, even though they are Christian, - one could be sorry!

Now we clearly see what a colossal force national experiences are - sometimes stronger than economic factors and class relations, which for so many years have been hollowed out as the only engine of history. We cannot give up thinking about this aspect of the 1917 revolution - the most tragic crisis in our history. Until now, such attempts are met with fierce resistance or complete misunderstanding. Of the numerous examples: Russophobia contains a statement by one of the leaders of the Social-Democrats. - Martov. He says that, having survived the threat of pogrom as a child, he preserved "the seeds of salutary hatred" for the rest of his life. B. Kushner reproaches me that I do not feel "the suffering of another being as my own," I do not understand the feelings of Martov or the poet Bialik caused by the pogroms. In vain I, apparently, explained that I want to refrain from "value judgments" altogether, but I am trying to understand: what happened to Russia? What happened is that one of the leaders of the revolution was a man whose deep psychology was not love for this country and its people, not even internationalist-Marxist ideas, but the seeds of salutary hatred "- to whom? And the situation was probably not typical for Martov alone. Of course - how not to regret the three-year-old Yulik, fearfully awaiting the pogrom? But speaking of history, how not to think about all of Russia, whose fate was in the hands of such leaders? After all, Russia is also a "creature" and the suffering of this creature you should feel too! whose fate was in the hands of such leaders? After all, Russia is also a "being", and the suffering of this creature should also be felt! whose fate was in the hands of such leaders? After all, Russia is also a "being", and the suffering of this creature should also be felt!

Yanov once compared the accusation of anti-Semitism with an atomic bomb in the hands of "opponents of nationalism." This is very subtly noted: we are talking about the fight against "nationalism" (of course, Russian - that is, about Russophobia), and not about protecting the Jewish people from some kind of threat. For example, how else to understand the strong reluctance to notice that only a certain trend of Jewish nationalism is associated with the "Small People" in my work - and to pretend that we are talking about the entire Jewish people (similarly, in connection with the participation of radical Jewry in the revolution). I try to try it on myself: of course, there are many episodes in Russian history that I find it hard to remember - for example, the suppression of Polish uprisings or the policy of Russification of foreigners. If I came across a work claiming that not the entire Russian people are responsible for this, but only some narrow layer of it, then, of course, would grab onto it and try to develop these arguments. How could an author, who holds a deeply national Jewish position, on the contrary, try to connect the actions of Sverdlov, Trotsky or the executioners of the Cheka with all his people? An author who is on a national basis, I think, would have

shaken his hand to write what Grossman said about Russia. Indeed, in the novel "Life and Fate" he describes with such eerie realism the death of Jews in gas chambers. And this would be the fate <B] of all the Jews of the USSR, if the plains of Eastern Europe were not strewn with Russian and Ukrainian bones. By this I do not mean at all that the Jews (or, say, the Georgians) did not fight, but by their number they could not influence the outcome of the war. And, of course, the Russians defended their country and by no means acquired the right to somehow oppress the Jews, but a certain gratitude, delicacy in exposing their shortcomings could be counted on from people living in the interests of the entire Jewish people. Could people, concerned about the Jewish fate, have raised this worldwide hubbub about the fantastic (as everyone can see now) threat of pogroms? Did its organizers really care how this would affect the relations of other nations - in a country where now almost everyone except Jews is being crushed! After all, this is similar to the cries of tender parents that their child lacks apples and oranges: you can still understand when everyone around is full - but what if other children are swollen with hunger? Will it not be perceived as a sign of cruel disregard for other people's lives? (there were also demands to give freedom to Jewish emigration, when our collective farmers did not have the right to leave their village). Film director S. Govorukhin writes (immediately assuring that Pamyat is not recruited!): "Try to look at our progressive press through the eyes of a normal healthy person. it turns out that the main event of the year is a scandal in the House of Writers. " "Either I don't understand anything," a normal reader will say, or there's something wrong here. " At best, he thinks so, and at worst, he will scratch the back of his head and say: "Maybe those who say that the Jews have seized newspapers, radio, telegraph are right?" Here's an example of the opposite effect. Idiocy, by God! Various letters come to the editorial offices of newspapers. I am quoting one of them from memory. An elderly Jewish couple writes: "Why do you devote so much space to this process (over Ostashvili - I. Sh.)? Don't you understand,

And in connection with "Russophobia" I encounter striking objections: as if by citing quotations from Yanov or Grossman, I "provoke pogroms." I don't believe in the possibility of pogroms, but whoever is really concerned about them should first of all appeal not to publish such works, one quotation of which could cause a pogrom! Finally, recent times have brought quite striking examples. So, in Moldova monstrous calls sounded: "Let's drown the Russians in Jewish blood!" But this did not cause any outrage, let alone the "Sabbath in the Central House of Writers". Apparently, the first part of the call fully justified the second. More specifically, separatism and Russophobia are the main goals, and the fate of the Jews is secondary.

Everything indicates that the trend, so influential in the "Small People", so skillfully manipulating the image of "anti-Semitism", is as little concerned about the fate of the Jewish people as the Socialist-Revolutionaries were about the fate of the peasants or the Bolsheviks of the workers. For them, the whole people is only a means, "dry straw": and I believe that someday the "silent majority" will also say their word. For example, he will say that it is impossible to dismiss the tragedy of the surrounding people as something not worth attention in comparison with their concerns. And not out of fear of the growth of "anti-Semitic sentiments", but simply because it is not

conscientious. There are indications that this is possible. For example, in the article "I, a Russian Jew" ("Century XX and the World", No. 10, 1990), the author writes: "And let us, Jews, repent first:

For Russia, fateful times have come again. Unfortunately, we all, all the peoples of Russia, were not given the opportunity to calmly comprehend the experience of the previous catastrophe. And how could we not all repeat the same mistakes again, but on a large scale, with even more dire consequences!

Published in the magazine "Our Contemporary" No. 12, 1991.

"REMAIN A DISSIDENT ..."

(excerpt)

No matter how harsh times the country went through, there were always people who fought against the inherently anti-popular policy of the authorities. Even Stalin's bloody regime was no exception in this sense. Many of our fellow citizens not only clearly understood what a "leader of the peoples" was, but also tried to resist him to the best of their ability and ability. The "benevolent" Brezhnev rule also faced quite noticeable opposition. Among those who then resisted the abuse of human rights, national interests and common sense, there were many scientists, members of the academy. Of course, the first was the name of A.D. Sakharov.

With the passage of time, it began to be forgotten that there were years when it was worth pronouncing "Sakharov", as another rebel scientist, I.R. Shafarevich, was immediately recalled. In his memoirs, A.I. Solzhenitsyn notes: he was arrested at the moment when he was discussing the contents of the collection of articles "From Under the Boulders" with Igor Rostislavovich Shafarevich. Anyone who in the sixties at least occasionally listened to the "voices of the enemy", surely remembers this name. He bravely defended many prisoners of conscience. "Soviet mathematician Igor Shafarevich protested ...", "Famous dissident Shafarevich gave an interview to foreign journalists ...". At that time, the broadcast was filled with messages of this kind. And today passions flare up around Shafarevich again. But the reason is different - the essay "Russophobia", published in the journal "Our Contemporary" [1]. Now the former dissident has become unacceptable for the left opposition. What happened?

NL Korenyuk, a scientific observer of the "Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR", received the task to meet with IR Shafarevich and learn about everything, as they say, firsthand. A recording of their conversation is published below.

You made a lot of noise with your "Russophobia". Opinions about her and about you are the most contradictory. Perplexity is often expressed: how did you, the famous dissident, betray your views.

- I do not see any fundamental changes in my position; rather, a certain widely accepted, standard set of views has changed, a certain general position that is easy and even useful to take, a certain set of judgments that are acquired mainly through someone's suggestion, and not through one's own search. Such a phenomenon exists in every society, in ours - especially in view of the inertia of totalitarian thinking. I fell out of this standard again, as I did before, that is, I remained a dissident. It is no coincidence that one publicist turned to the KGB with a request that they take me seriously there.

So, is your position the same?

- You know, reading my works of fifteen years ago, I note with regret how the ideas expressed in them coincide with my current ones. A person must change over time.

How and when did the idea of "Russophobia" come about?

- In the seventy-eighth: this year in the Parisian Russian-language magazine "Bulletin of the Russian Christian Movement" published a collection of articles on Russian history and modernity. There were also my articles (albeit of a different type) in the collection, in particular, "Rearguard Battles of Marxism", in which it was proved that the state practice of Lenin and Stalin follows from the fundamental provisions of Marxism, and is not its "distortion"; by the way, similar views - nice to note - were recently expressed by A. Tsipko [2]. This is by the way, and most importantly: some authors of the collection drew attention to the current prevailing in our country, proclaiming the inferiority, inferiority of the Russian people (its consciousness, culture and history), and mainly refuted this kind of position using historical, concrete material. After reading the articles, I came to the conclusion: there is a certain trend that has its roots, and it is not enough to simply refute certain statements, you need to really understand the phenomenon. This was the impetus for writing "Russophobia".

Have you finished?

- Graduated and began to distribute in 1983, without any hope of publication.

That is, the usual samizdat.

- Yes, I made several dozen photocopies and distributed them to my friends - those in whom they could arouse interest. It was a dead time, a time for the complete suppression of samizdat, but to my surprise, after a few months I heard the first responses.

What is the main idea of Russophobia after all? Many critics have the impression that you see the origins of all the troubles that befell the Russians in this century in the Jews.

- I do not understand at all how such an impression could have formed. The work considers this point of view, and provides a number of arguments confirming my disagreement with it. In short, my concept is as follows: firstly, we are talking about a certain ideological trend - about works of samizdat and tamizdat, trying to prove the existence of some kind of fundamental flaw in the Russian psyche: "the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave", "there was no history, but there was being outside of history", "the Russians proved their political impotence", "Russia brought the world more evil than any other country", etc. The entire revolution was entirely derived from the Russian tradition, which allegedly perverted Marxism, and was presented as a return to the spirit of the Moscow kingdom. As you ponder and study these ideas, I came across the work of the then little-known French historian Augustin Koshen, a specialist in the French Revolution, and was amazed: analyzing the cultural and ideological prerequisites of the revolution, he described a phenomenon very similar to ours, and very vividly, sometimes with almost literal coincidence of details. I remember that I simply could not sit still, I jumped up all the time reading his book. In recent years,

Koshen's works seem to have become much more popular in the West: republished, translated into many languages. I hope they will be translated in our country too, because in them, in particular, we are talking about such a layer of people who oppose themselves to the rest of the people, treat their traditions with contempt and thereby assert their right to dispose of this people, as the material of his own creativity - in this Koshen saw the spiritual prerequisite for the Jacobin dictatorship. But I came to the conclusion that there is a much more general phenomenon that accompanies any social crisis - the emergence of similar aggressive elite groups. I would like to emphasize that they do not have any specific national coloring.

Including Jewish?

- What relation to the Jews can have Koshen's works devoted to the French Revolution, in which the Jews did not play any role? In addition, I tried to expand the application of his concept. Incidentally, in the English Revolution of the 17th century. Jews could not take part - for the simple reason that they were expelled from England in the 13th century, and they were forbidden to live there on pain of death; only Cromwell lifted this ban, albeit formally.

O. Koshen used the term "small people", without investing in it any ethnic content and referring to the minority of this or that people, who feel their chosenness and isolation. Just speaking about the modern direction in our journalism (we talked about it above), I really drew attention to the presence of an influential Jewish nationalist movement in it. It is reflected in statements such as, for example, "after the disappearance of the Russian intelligentsia, the Jews filled the resulting vacuum," and so on.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the nationality seemed to many to be a relic, the ideas of the merger of nations in a single socialist society were put forward. But we see: in the twentieth century, just the opposite happened - the flourishing of national currents that had not been previously suspected (Valonian, Basque nationalism, etc.), not to mention the national explosion in our country. The only novelty in my approach is that I am talking specifically about Jewish nationalism.

And yet with you - it is striking - he is assigned a particularly dangerous role.

- Nationalism often leads to dangerous consequences. Is Basque Terrorism Safe? In my work, we are talking about a certain trend in Jewish nationalism, which had a decisive influence on the literature about which I wrote, and I argued in detail that this trend should in no way be equated with the Jewish nation. In "Russophobia" it is emphasized that we are talking about free choice, individual participation; noted, in particular, the great role of Amalrik, Sinyavsky and others who are not Jews. In addition, it contains references to Jewish authors who opposed Jewish nationalism and much more sharply than me.

For example?

- The collection "Russia and the Jews" was quoted. All its authors are Jews who emigrated from Russia after the Civil War. They have their own point of view on revolution, war, on Jewish pogroms; it is an exceptionally deep and honest work whose creators have risen above traditional prejudices. I also gave an example of the novel by the contemporary author F. Svetov "Open the Doors", so sharp that, despite the publicity, it has not yet been published in our country. In other words, I am trying to clarify the role of the "small people" - a general historical phenomenon, which at different times can be influenced by religious, national and other factors.

So what, there was a misunderstanding?

- The misunderstanding, apparently, should be spoken in quotation marks. The simple reader may not have finished reading the work. But the critic who writes a special article about it expresses the ideology of the very "small people" who try to be invisible as a minority and hide behind arguments about the interests of the oppressed class, nation, or even universal values.

You are against Russians being considered slaves by nature, dark, downtrodden, etc. However, if they are not, how, then, did they allow Russophobia and, in your opinion, turned out to be a toy in the hands of a certain minority? In short, how did the "big people" allow the "small people" to command themselves?

- I think the calls of the "small people", inciting Russophobia, and its entire ideology, are very contagious. One of the authors of the literature I am considering described his stratum as a "tribe of giants", his environment as a "human pigsty." Belonging to the "tribe of giants" is extremely tempting, so people easily assimilate their point of view, and everyone who assimilates himself does not at all belong to the "pigsty". The accumulated historical experience will finally make it possible to understand this.

Do you think they don't understand this yet?

- If you follow Koshen, the French people did not recognize their "small people" in the same way. This, apparently, is the nature of any social cataclysm. How is the ideology of the minority imposed on the majority, you ask? Why did the German people allow National Socialism? Why did the French people allow terror? Koshen gives a vivid image - "the Lilliputians bind Gulliver and shower him with poisoned arrows." The reasons are different: processing public opinion, inciting antagonism, creating an "enemy image". There is something here that resembles a disease, the outcome of which is not decided at all by the ratio of the weight of the disease-causing bacilli and the sick organism. There is also some kind of general mechanism, it is not for nothing that there are so many similarities in such cataclysms as the English, French and Russian revolutions.

Do you deny the concepts of "national psychology", "national character"?

- Of course not. But since such similar upheavals have taken place (you can also add the religious wars of the Reformation era, the domination of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, etc.), the reasons should not be sought in the individual psychology of a particular people. Yes, they are not looked for until the conversation about the Russians comes, but I have never heard, even among the fiercest critics of the French Revolution, that terror, for example, is a French national tradition.

Of course, the national character is somehow reflected in the course of historical development, but rather in its external forms. In our case, an essential feature of the revolution is the suppression of national, Russian feelings, the word "patriot" sounded like "counterrevolutionary."

And what then is bad about the idea of universal human values (you consider it a cover for the ideology of the "small people")? Perhaps, in terms of its level, it is higher than the class and national ones? Moreover, the national factor is not always creative, as you say. I don't want to give examples: I'd better share the widespread doubt now, especially among the intelligentsia: Russian nationalism is the last hope of the apparatus losing its power, which in despair will stake on it, and the dictatorship of the Russian fascists will replace the dictatorship of the communists. The new dictatorship seems to have plenty of supporters. And will it not turn out that "Russophobia", regardless of your desires, will make its contribution here. After all, what conclusion can be drawn from it? Down with the "small people"! No, God have mercy, you are not calling for this,

- You asked three different questions. First. The idea of universal human values is not "bad" at all as long as it does not deny national individuality. In the same way, national values are good to the extent that they do not suppress human individuality. Nonnational humanity, in my opinion, cannot exist in the same way as a state consisting of subjects devoid of individuality. Let us recall that our troubles also began with the exaggerated introduction of some supranational values: internationalism, the world socialist revolution, etc.

Second. If we are discussing the possibility of a totalitarian coup, it is necessary to sort out all the forces that the apparatus could use as allies: not only Russian nationalism, but also the nationalism of non-Russian peoples (as it was at the beginning of the revolution), as well as the businessmen of the criminal economy (together with their apparatus) and foreign companies interested in exploiting cheap labor and our natural resources. Of all these theoretical possibilities, the alliance of the party apparatus with the Russian nationalists seems to me the most fantastic. The apparatus was brought up on a 100% denationalized ideology. I was amazed more than once by such passages in the speeches of Brezhnev, Andropov and similar figures: "Over 50 years of the existence of our state ...", "Our state in its entire 60-year history", etc. : that is, it existed before "not theirs" state. Russian national ideas were subjected to the most severe persecution: for example, VN Osipov, who published the Russian patriotic samizdat magazine Veche and, incidentally, did not come out with any political demands, served eight years in the camp. When in the early seventies the first sprouts of the revival of

Russian spiritual traditions appeared in the Soviet press, a blow was struck at them by such a prominent representative of the party apparatus as A.N. Yakovlev (the well-known article "Against Antihistoricism" in Literaturnaya Gazeta). Indeed, even now not one of the major party leaders - neither in the CPSU nor in the RCP - has declared that his main concern is the salvation of the country and the people, and not the implementation of certain ideological dogmas. Of course, there are different people in the government, including those who are patriotic,

But in my opinion, it's not about ideology. If the question arises "who will win", the government, wishing to remain power, will abandon the old icons and prayers and will not blink an eye. All to the side - just to survive. And this is where propaganda in the spirit of "great Russia united forever" will come in handy. As for Brezhnev and Andropov, I agree with you, but after all, Yakovlev, after the article mentioned, was in disgrace and was exiled (don't count it as blasphemy, of course, this is not Osipov's eight years) ... to Canada, that is, by apparatus standards, also to link. Let us recall the recent XXVIII Congress of the CPSU: who was most often attacked by the conservative delegates? On Yakovlev, who, in their opinion, almost ruined the entire party and the country. But how unanimously they applauded the "Kuzmichs" with their calls for the revival of Russia, but Russia is, in fact, Stalinist-Brezhnev. And the generals for this,

- The word "Russia" has now become the same bargaining chip as "mercy" and "humanism" - everyone uses it. So it's in the sense that they put into words. You yourself say that we are talking about Stalinist-Brezhnev Russia, that is, the one where the peasantry was exterminated, the Russian people died out (and continues to die out). Russia is in one of the last places in education and medical care, its contribution to the all-Union budget is completely disproportionate to the contribution of other republics.

But let us finally return to the question of the "danger" of my article "Russophobia". The reasoning behind this is general. In the same way, one could say that since you see the danger of Russian nationalism, you can conclude: Down with Russian nationalists (or Russians)? No, God have mercy, you are not calling for this, I am talking about mass consciousness.

Well, I would now like to move on to what your concept is based on, to find out, in particular, the question: why did you give such an ominous character to the passages from the Old Testament?

- I wanted to show what are the foundations in the Jewish religious tradition, on which the current of the chosen minority, which is expressed in the works I have quoted, can rely on. If I wanted to analyze some other trend, for example, the Zionist (in the Western sense of the word), the desire to return to Israel, to create my own state (more religious, with the Temple in the center), then I would cite other quotes. If I wanted to analyze any feature of Russian history, I would quote third quotes.

But the fact of the matter is that the Old Testament is not only Jewish history, but in the religious sense it is also Russian history.

- The quotes are the same, but their perception is the opposite.

The Jewish tradition is based on the Old Testament, which contains this promise: dominion over other nations who will serve, give their wealth to Israel, etc. The Christian tradition rejects such an interpretation, considers it a delusion.

What is your attitude to the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"?

- It always seemed to me completely incomprehensible the influence and distribution that they received. Obviously, they have something that seems interesting - right or wrong, good or bad. I do not understand this. It is usually said: "The" Protocols "are striking in that what they said was confirmed during the revolution and after it," this is considered proof of their authenticity. I carefully read the "Protocols", writing out all the predictions that came true, and they seem to me to be strikingly weak. For example, such a forecast: the new government will control the economy with the help of a progressive tax. Apparently, it simply did not occur to the authors that the entire industry could be nationalized. Nothing was said about agriculture - apparently, the idea of collective farms and state farms was beyond the imagination of the authors. Supposed, that the influence of the nobility will be undermined, but this happened during the French Revolution (the country in question is, apparently, France). Finally, it is argued that power will be in the hands of the Jews. However, in the nineteenth century, there was already a whole literature that preached that revolutionary activity, on the one hand, and the power of the stock exchange, on the other, would lead to the rule of the Jews over the world. So in the "Protocols" I did not find anything fundamentally new in comparison with what has already been expressed more than once. on the one hand, and the power of the stock exchange, on the other, will lead to the rule of the Jews over the world. So in the "Protocols" I did not find anything fundamentally new in comparison with what has already been expressed more than once. on the one hand, and the power of the stock exchange, on the other, will lead to the rule of the Jews over the world. So in the "Protocols" I did not find anything fundamentally new in comparison with what has already been expressed more than once.

By the way, in "Russophobia" there is not a word about Freemasons, about a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. Is this really your belief or unwillingness to go to extremes?

- This is really my conviction, just like the desire not to go to extremes. History has its own logic, it is not a collection of accidents, but represents a natural, partly purposeful process. The development of a child in the womb of the mother is also a natural process, but no one will call it someone's conspiracy. Throughout history, large groups of people, without collusion, often work in a certain direction. It seems to me that the mechanism of such processes is still poorly understood. In the meantime, it turns out

that, having felt the "logic" of the story, people slide towards the trivial concept of a conspiracy.

And yet it sometimes seems that you are "looking for a Jew." Take, for example, the description of the shooting of the royal family. You have Beloborodov - Weisbart, Goloshchekin - Shaya, plus - I don't know what sources confirm this - a couplet from Heine's poem about Tsar Belshazzar, who insulted Jehovah and was killed for it, inscribed on the wall of the room where the execution took place. The Jewish surnames of hundreds of people who led the OGPU and who were involved in the destruction of churches are diligently listed. Are you too biased when choosing "negative characters?"

- What do you mean "looking for a Jew"? I want to draw the reader's attention to the exceptionally large role that radical revolutionary Jewry sometimes played, completely disproportionate to its share in the population. Regarding Beloborodov: I have more than once met in many works the mention of his real name; There are memoirs of a German prisoner who was in a detachment that guarded the royal family (published in the German weekly "Seven Days") - they tell about all the leaders of the Soviet power in Yekaterinburg, the name of Beloborodov, Weisbart, is also mentioned. The couplet from Heine is given in the book of Sokolov, who was investigating the shooting of the royal family; it even says that the name of Belshazzar was changed to "Belshazzar" (by analogy with the king).

The list of heads of GPU departments of the "White Sea Canal era" is taken from R. Konquist's book, and Solzhenitsyn draws a similar picture in "The Archipelago". Finally, the list of anti-religious propagandists is taken from a manuscript circulated in samizdat by the late Ukrainian academician Beletsky. All these works have no national orientation.

However, you write: "After the coup, Kamenev was the head of state for several days, then Sverdlov until his death. Trotsky was at the head of the army, Zinoviev at the head of Petrograd, Kamenev at the head of Petrograd.), Oskar Ryvkin was at the head of the Komsomol, at first - for several months - Efim Tsetlin, etc. " [1, p. 166]. And where did Lenin go? How do you assess his position?

- Lenin was a man who gave himself completely to the revolution, and he looked at everything that happened around him from this point of view. This, in particular, is his attitude towards the nation. He considered it true patriotism to wish defeat in the war for his government, while he used the expression "revolutionary national pride." And let's see, what he offered Russians to be proud of: the fact that they, like other nations, were able to create a revolutionary working class. And by whom - Radishchev, Decembrists, Narodnaya Volya. But we will not find in this series the names of Pushkin, Lomonosov, Tchaikovsky, Dmitry Donskoy, not to mention Sergius of Radonezh.

The nation was a conservative force, it supported the existing world order, it was an obstacle for revolutionaries. It is no coincidence, therefore, that Lenin very peculiarly

imagined the purpose of the Russian nation: "... internationalism on the part of the oppressive or the so-called" great "nation (although great only by its violence, great only in the way that formal equality of the nation, but also in such inequality that would compensate on the part of the oppressing nation, the big nation, the inequality that develops in the nation in fact. " All speeches on the national question at the XII Party Congress - Stalin, Zinoviev, Yakovlev, Bukharin - were in the spirit of this dictum. They all spoke about the danger of great-power chauvinism, that it must be ruthlessly destroyed, and Stalin's report named specific measures: when and which factories to transfer to Central Asia, which to Transcaucasia. That is, it was then that an impetus was given to the phenomenon, which, as we see now, subjected Russia and its resources to devastation. Whatever it was about - be it a world revolution, support for regimes in Cuba or Ethiopia - resources were drawn mainly from Russia. Now the figures have already been named: 70 billion rubles a year, transferred by it to the Union budget.

So, Russophobia remained. How does it manifest itself today?

- It appears much brighter than before. Previously, I had to extract works of samizdat, emigre works in order to draw some conclusions about the ongoing processes, of course, with some risk of making a mistake. Now Russophobia declares itself more sharply and convincingly, since views are expressed in journals with a huge circulation, old works are reprinted - emigre, samizdat, which acquire a completely different meaning in connection with a new turn in history. It is necessary to rethink our entire history, to find out what happened to us. If we follow the concepts that gave rise to Russophobia, the answer about the causes of our troubles comes down to the following: Russians have a burdened gene pool, and Stalinism is a national national phenomenon. Moreover, there is a point of view that collectivization is the result of peasant ideology, and the social base of Stalin was the patriarchal peasantry; it turns out that the ruined peasantry has become its own murderer. Responsibility is thus shifted from the criminals (those who planned collectivization, directed it, glorified it) onto their victims. But the matter is much deeper: we are going through a crisis, perhaps the most difficult in our entire history, and we are not sure whether we will have enough strength to survive it. You need to gather all your strength, you need at least some degree of confidence, some real hope for a better outcome. And if "the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave," then there is no hope. If we have a "burdened gene pool", then the situation is hopeless - the gene pool cannot be changed! is shifted from the criminals (those who planned collectivization, directed it, glorified it) onto their victims. But the matter is much deeper: we are going through a crisis, perhaps the most difficult in our entire history, and we are not sure whether we will have enough strength to survive it. You need to gather all your strength, you need at least some degree of confidence, some real hope for a better outcome. And if "the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave," then there is no hope. If we have a "burdened gene pool", then the situation is hopeless - the gene pool cannot be changed! is shifted from the criminals (those who planned collectivization, directed it, glorified it) onto their victims. But the matter is much deeper: we are going through a crisis, perhaps the most difficult in our entire history, and we are not sure whether we will have enough strength

to survive it. You need to gather all your strength, you need at least some degree of confidence, some real hope for a better outcome. And if "the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave," then there is no hope. If we have a "burdened gene pool", then the situation is hopeless - the gene pool cannot be changed! And if "the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave," then there is no hope. If we have a "burdened gene pool", then the situation is hopeless - the gene pool cannot be changed! And if "the Russian soul is a thousand-year-old slave," then there is no hope. If we have a "burdened gene pool", then the situation is hopeless - the gene pool cannot be changed!

What to do?

- The only way out is discussion. After all, what happens: if any idea seems unacceptable to a person, it is pushed into the subconscious and gives rise to neuroses. Hence the hysterical reaction to "Russophobia". I think the passions will gradually subside, and a calm discussion of the problem will become possible. I just try to reason, relying not on emotions, but on facts ...

*First published in the journal "Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR" No. 1,
1990*

RUSSIAN QUESTION

In a time of publicity, when the flow of information every day brings new and new facts from the recent past and present, previously kept under seven seals, it is difficult to be surprised at something. But already the first phrase from this article amazed. There she is. "Of all the burning problems that have accumulated in our life, the issue of relations between nations seems to be the most painful one." I foresee the bewilderment of the readers. Like, what's so special, it's a fact.

But this article was written in the fall of 1973. When, it would seem, there was not even a hint of interethnic conflicts in the USSR.

"Too much has been painful here and too little time, perhaps, left to correct what has been done," the lonely voice of an honest man tried to break through. But they did not want to hear him.

The article "Isolation or Rapprochement? (National Question in the USSR)" by Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, laureate of the Lenin Prize I. Shafarevich was able to find a place only in "samizdat".

How could a mathematician at that time of stagnation foresee the events that became the main surprise of perestroika?

This was the first question that I asked I. Shafarevich at our meeting.

- For this I had a number of reasons. The first is my personal observations. In my youth, I loved to travel a lot, wandered in the mountains, met people of different nationalities. Observations have accumulated. The second is the experience that was already at that time in other countries. It amazed me - especially how little people paid attention to the colossal mistake that had been made before. The entire 19th century, at least the West, in the entire range of Western thought, from extreme revolutionaries to liberals, was convinced that the issue of nationalism was obsolete. That this is a relic of feudalism, barbarism. Some believed that "softening of morals", progress would gradually lead to this bright future. Others argued that a new society, in which national ideas would disappear, would be created as a result of the revolution. For example, in the "Communist Manifesto" about the proletarians it is said: "Modern industrial labor, the modern yoke of capital ... have erased all national character from it ...". Or: "The workers do not have a fatherland ... National isolation and opposites of peoples are disappearing more and more with the development of the bourgeoisie ... The domination of the proletariat will further accelerate their disappearance."

The First World War was a shock for many in this sense. How did such a colossal crisis split the world into different nations?

But national humiliation, which was later directed towards the mainstream of national aggression in Germany, became the cause of the Second World War.

After the Second World War, the national question became even more aggravated throughout the planet. As a result of the national liberation movement, a number of new states appeared in Africa, Asia and Latin America. But even in these states - seemingly narrowly national ones - this issue remained quite painful. Unusually brutal tribal wars began. For example, the war in Nigeria led to the almost complete destruction of the huge Ibo tribe, more than a million people died. Let's remember Ethiopia, Sudan ...

Completely new types of nationalism have emerged. For example, Basque nationalism in Spain, which still spills over into violent terrorism. Or Walloon nationalism in Belgium, which we did not even suspect, Breton in France, Welsh in England.

Thirdly, in the 70s we had a national samizdat, in which national feelings were sharply manifested: Western Ukrainian, Georgian, Estonian ...

According to the writer, People's Deputy V.I. Belov, ideological guidelines and conclusions about the merger and disappearance of nations did not come true ...

- National feelings, aspirations, from moderate to the most extreme, have turned out to be one of the main driving forces of the modern world. In a sense, this is generally a sore point for humanity. If you look at previous centuries, then he always shook the world in the same way. Thus, those ideas about future national relations that took shape in the 19th century do not just need to be corrected, they need a completely different consideration.

In any case, in relation to the current situation in the USSR, where interethnic conflicts are acquiring catastrophic proportions, which often manifest themselves in the most ugly forms.

Recently, one has sometimes heard, sometimes covertly, and sometimes directly, that the Russians are to blame for everything, they say. They are called occupiers, colonizers ...

- This slogan about the occupiers is a mobilizing force for extreme national trends. He simplifies all problems by declaring the Russians to be the only culprits in all misfortunes. This slogan, it seems to them, unites and helps to solve national problems. But this is completely wrong. Bitterness will never help. It will blind you, cause a backlash.

Igor Rostislavovich, let's return to the "occupants". They led some kind of strange occupation, such a one can hardly be found anywhere else in history. They do not enjoy any benefits or advantages.

And here is the paradox - the "occupants" sometimes live worse than these peoples. Once a doctor of sciences specializing in national issues spoke to our editorial office. He explained as follows: "The leaders of the regions of the RSFSR

asked badly from the center." Is it really really that Smolensk, Ryazan, Tambov and other Russian regions have had shy bosses for decades?

- In this matter, it is dangerous for us to fall into subjectivity. According to the proverb "Someone else's tears are water." You need to check yourself carefully. For example, in polemicizing with Solzhenitsyn, Academician Sakharov reproached him precisely for his one-sided assessment. He wrote: "... after all, we all know that the horrors of the civil war, dispossession of kulaks, hunger, terror, the Patriotic War, unheard-of in the history of anti-people brutal repressions of millions who returned from captivity, the persecution of believers, that this all equally affected the Russians and non-Russian subjects of the Soviet state. "

It seems to me that this issue requires careful consideration. The argument "We all know" is not enough. In my youth, traveling around the country, I looked at the ruins of villages in Central Asia (the consequences of the fight against the Basmachs or resettlement "to cotton"), and abandoned villages in Karelia (eviction of entire villages), wandered through the completely silent areas of Karachay or Balkaria on Caucasus, the entire population of which was sent to Central Asia in a few days. And there, in Central Asia, I suddenly heard the purest German language - these were exiles from the Volga region.

Indeed, this period hit hard on all peoples. Three peoples found themselves in a tragic situation, once collectively called Rus: Russians, Belarusians, Ukrainians. And the reasons for this lie deep. Let's imagine, for example, collectivization. It was preceded by an ideological campaign to create anger, hatred of the village, village culture. Then this hostile village was united by the term "Raseyushka-Rus". The poets said that this was a "scandalous word", that she was "hanged", that they declared a war of death on her, swore of hatred, and so on. Still, the term itself, although it meant any village, somehow singled out Russia. And I think that the enthusiasts brought up on these verses, when they started collectivization, when they saw the individual features of this "Race", it mobilized them more,

This ideology also has deeper roots. For example, Stalin, in his speeches on the national question at the X, XII, XIV, XVI Congresses, always asserted that the main danger in national relations is great-power - or, as he sometimes said, Great-Russian - chauvinism. A special position in this matter was occupied by the XII Congress of the RCP (b), where much attention was paid to national relations. The congress unanimously spoke out against what they expressed by the word "rusotyyap". They talked about "complete great-power Russian chauvinism." They called for "cutting the head of our Russian chauvinism" or "burning it with fire." It was argued that the Russians "need to artificially put themselves in a position lower than other nations." Even Stalin's words that we have, besides great-power chauvinism, and nationalism in other nations, although the main danger is great-power chauvinism, were met with hostility. "This point of view is not ours," there is nothing to talk about local chauvinism at this congress. The entire congress was held in an atmosphere of delicate concern for the national feelings of all nations, except for the Russian one. And it never

occurred to anyone to think that Russians, too, have national feelings that can also be hurt.

But after all, Lenin was not at that congress for the first time.

- It's right. The speakers at this congress were based on the documents of V.I. Lenin, which were then widely unpublished, but communicated to all delegates. Now they are all known. It said that "internationalism on the part of an oppressive or so-called" great "nation (although great only by its violence, great only in the way that the Derzhimorda is great) should consist not only in the observance of the formal equality of nations, but also in such inequality that would compensate on the part of the oppressing nation, the nation is large, the inequality that develops in life in fact. "

But what about the theory of class struggle? After all, among the Russians there were also the oppressed. The proletariat, the peasants. Their life was not sweet. And blood was pouring. Let us recall the Lena execution, known from school textbooks. What did they, the oppressed, have to compensate?

- This tradition is even older. It goes far into pre-revolutionary history. Western thought in the 19th century held that Russia is a kind of obstacle that blocks the way for progress, no matter how anyone understands the concept of progress.

Or in an article by Marx and Engels in Novaya Rhine Gazeta: "To the sentimental phrases about brotherhood addressed to us on behalf of the most counter-revolutionary nations of Europe, we answer: hatred of the Russians was and continues to be among the Germans their first revolutionary passion: At the time of the revolution (I meant the revolution of 1848 - I.Sh.), hatred for the Czechs and Croats was added to this, and only with the help of the most decisive terrorism ... can we, together with the Poles and Magyars, protect the revolution from danger. "

Such a policy. How can you explain all this by the sluggishness or indifference of some leader? On the contrary, the leaders were brought up in such a tradition.

Let us recall the virgin lands on which huge funds were thrown.

- Although quite close, outside the outskirts of Moscow, - villages perished. - Not only did they not raise the Non-Black Earth Region. It was being destroyed.

The last blow to the village was not delivered by collectivization, not even by war. And the Khrushchev-Brezhnev policy. First, the cattle were taken away, given to the collective farm. Then they sold it back.

They were allowed to mow hay for a cow in the forest in order to take one tenth for themselves, and the rest for the collective farm. All textbooks on the history of the Middle Ages say that the church robbed the working people, taking from them tithes, that is, a tenth. Here, one tenth was left.

So people were weaned from village labor. All these mergers, the splinters of collective farms. The policy of "unpromising villages". This was the policy of the final blow. As Solzhenitsyn said, the Brezhnev skating rink rolled through the village.

Inequality is created by the sharp difference between prices for various agricultural products, which differs many times from the ratio of world prices. Foreigners who come to us pay attention to this. They are, for example, amazed at the difference in prices for potatoes and citrus fruits, which is strikingly different from the proportion of prices worldwide.

The situation with medical care and schools in the Russian, Belarusian and Ukrainian villages is disastrous. Severe demographic consequences. The population is almost not growing; it is shrinking in the Non-Black Earth Region. Such a policy cuts the root from which the whole country grows. This is not just a question of personal grievances. This is a question of a reasonable attitude towards the future of the whole country.

The transition of individual republics to self-financing seems to me to be a kind of paradox. It is said to be a wonderful experiment. But what kind of experiment? How will farms develop in unequal conditions?

The most urgent problem of the transition to self-financing of the RSFSR arises. And a super-essential - an urgent program of relations between the republics that have switched to self-financing, with those who have not yet switched. I am not speaking from the point of view that the RSFSR will not and should not provide assistance to other republics. First, it seems to me that this is not in the spirit of the Russian people. Secondly, it does not seem reasonable. We are all deeply connected historically and economically. A crisis in one area will affect everyone. But it seems to me that help should not be impersonal. Should not come from the union budget. It should be of a personal nature: from such and such a republic such and such ... Then this assistance can be taken into account, reasonable amounts can be found. And on the other hand, after that we may no longer be called occupiers, colonialists.

The way out is always to really formulate problems and not be afraid to call them by their proper names, not to drive them into the subconscious. If we are talking about the secession of the republic, then the problem should be formulated that way. Then put, discuss in this form. And to find out to what extent it enjoys the support of the entire population of the republic, what are the social consequences of this, within what boundaries the republic should secede? How can the property that exists in this republic be divided? How to preserve the rights of national minorities, which in number in a number of republics are almost equal to the national majority? And, perhaps, as a result of such a realistic formulation of the question, the very acuteness of the problem will weaken. Now, it seems to me, it is being interpreted in the form of a slogan, an irrational slogan, which because of this is always the most dangerous.

There are many troubles in all republics. Who is to blame for this? Some blame the Russians for everything, others blame the Freemasons, and still others blame the apparatus. In a word, they are looking for specific enemies.

- Our enemy, it seems to me, is not certain people, but some kind of spiritual fad, a stream of thought that has swept the whole world. This is the desire to turn people into standard cogs of a huge machine, into a mass devoid of individuality, controlled and directed. We would like to subordinate nature to the same mechanical logic - this is where the entire modern ecological crisis comes from: the destruction of nature and the destruction of the social environment of man, first of all, the nation - these are different sides of the same process, which can be seen in almost all countries of the world.

Look, in our country too: Russians, Ukrainians, Balts, and small peoples of Siberia complain about the erasure of national individuality. Therefore, the contradictions between these peoples are often only visible, only a natural desire to find a specific culprit for their plight. The reason for this situation is common, the one that threatens Lake Baikal, Sevan or the Volga.

In this sense, all peoples are not enemies, but allies, in the most essential their interests coincide. And on the path of mutual understanding, we are able to realize this unity of our fundamental interests, and then find a common way to overcome the current crisis.

*First published in the newspaper "Komsomolskaya Pravda", February 14, 1990.
Conducted by E. Chernykh.*

WHAT IS PATRIOTISM?

Obviously, this is some kind of force that unites the people, preventing them from falling apart into separate individuals, so the question would be better formulated as follows: what is a people, why is humanity divided into such communities? These phenomena - the people and the force that binds them, patriotism - are manifested at all times that history covers. And they go much deeper, as can be seen in the examples of "primitive", ie. pre-state societies, if only to expand the concept of people to "ethnos", including both the tribe and the union of tribes. Actually, the problem has even deeper roots - obviously, some similar force unites animal societies: a flock of wolves or wild geese. But we will not go that far here, marking this aspect only in order to outline the size of the phenomenon.

Just on the example of the rudiment of a nation - one tribe - our question is easier to answer, and a lot of material has been collected by ethnographers. If the native managed to explain the true meaning of what the ethnographer wanted to know from him, then the answer to the question: what unites you in one tribe? - in most cases it was the same, although for us quite unexpected: "Our common myths." But this answer will become, perhaps, less surprising if we remember that Dostoevsky also linked the birth of a nation with the emergence of religion: Judaism among Jews, Islam among Arabs, Orthodoxy among Russians.

To appreciate the answer received by ethnographers, it is necessary to understand the meaning that the natives put into the concept of myth. The myths of the tribe were secret knowledge that was communicated only to initiates (usually most adult men received initiation). But myths were not only told: they also empathized in rituals and ceremonies in which all initiates participated. In this they resembled modern religions with the difference that they were more dramatic and soul-stirring: with masks and dances, often with human sacrifices. The meaning of the ceremonies was to return to the "mythological time" when the world and man were created. Contact with this special "creative" time filled the present with new forces: it ensured the fertility of nature, the course of the cosmic process, and the social stability of the community. The myth revealed to man his place, his significant, creative role in space, thus filling his life with meaning and giving strength for a bright, beautiful life in conditions, the severity of which sometimes we cannot even imagine. This role of myth was tragically demonstrated when, in contact with European civilization, the system of ceremonies and myths disintegrated. Ethnographers see this as the main reason for the extinction of "primitive" peoples: the onset of apathy, a decline in vitality, a drop in the birth rate.

In this example, I think, one can see the meaning and function of large modern nations, as well as the force that unites each of them - patriotism. Apparently, the existence of some intermediate instance between the individual person and the entire Cosmos is necessary. Only through this instance is a person able to feel the meaningfulness of his existence in History and Space. History, for example, is not the history of individual

people, but of nations, and only through belonging to his own people can a person feel the meaning of this grandiose process, "come into contact with the secrets of the past and the future." For example, as Academician Likhachev describes the attitude of a resident of Ancient Russia, reflected in ancient Russian literature: "A person, living in the world, remembered the world as a whole as a huge unity, felt his place in this world."

Only through inclusion in this community - ethnos - a person is able to solve some super-complex problems that life puts before him. One can imagine that the ethnos in some incomprehensible way for us unites the intellect and souls of individuals and creates a kind of superintelligence and oversoul. And some of the problems of life are feasible only for such superintelligence, and the individual human mind is insufficient to solve them. He may not be aware of the true logic of the solution even after it has been found, considering this solution only as a "norm of behavior", obligatory in a given society. For example, in "primitive" societies there is a very complex system of rules of conduct and prohibitions that prevent marriages between close relatives (exogamy). At the same time, the members of these societies do not, of course, have any idea of the harmful genetic consequences of closely related marriages and consider their existing prohibitions as "taboos" that do not require any justification (except perhaps that they were introduced by mythological ancestors). "Primitive" societies faced no less difficult environmental, economic and social problems than we do. They solved them very well, as evidenced by our very existence and the world that they left us as a legacy: without ozone holes and greenhouse effect, with clean air, rivers teeming with fish and fertile soils. Moreover, the solution to the most cardinal of these problems was obtained precisely at the supra-individual level and is often recorded in myths, a system of rituals and prohibitions: for example, the already mentioned exogamy, the development of fire, the domestication of animals,

And closer history, up to the present, is full of examples of such accomplishments, which clearly have their own logic, but incomprehensible or completely misinterpreted by the individual consciousness of contemporaries, so that logic is obviously a manifestation of the nation's "intellect" or "soul." So, in the 17th century. in England, a completely new, dynamic, energetic way of life arose: an industrial society and parliamentary democracy. It shaped the life of England, shaped the United States, spread to Western Europe, and swept nearly the entire world. But at the time of its creation, no one thought about such consequences. Then it was clear to all sane people, including the king and his advisers, that the "progressive" way of life is a centralized monarchy, as in Spain, France, the strengthening Russian kingdom or the Ottoman Empire. Parliaments were perceived as reactionary remnants of the feudal era. And the supporters of the new social order themselves proclaimed (of course, quite sincerely) that they were creating a "state of saints", paving the way for the "fifth monarchy" - the monarchy of Jesus Christ. And it took several centuries and the famous work of the most talented historian Max Weber "Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism" for us to at least begin to guess - what is the connection between the ascetic-fatalistic ideology of Protestantism of the Calvinist sense and the spirit of capitalism. pave the way for the "fifth monarchy" - the monarchy of Jesus Christ. And it

took several centuries and the famous work of the most talented historian Max Weber "Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism" for us to at least begin to guess - what is the connection between the ascetic-fatalistic ideology of Protestantism of the Calvinist sense and the spirit of capitalism. pave the way for the "fifth monarchy" - the monarchy of Jesus Christ. And it took several centuries and the famous work of the most talented historian Max Weber "Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism" for us to at least begin to guess - what is the connection between the ascetic-fatalistic ideology of Protestantism of the Calvinist sense and the spirit of capitalism.

And now, in the main issues facing humanity, our hope is in the power of the same supra-individual reason. A striking (and perhaps the main) example is the ecological crisis. It arose from a completely specific orientation of modern technological civilization: it is able to solve each of its ecological problems only with the help of a deeper and more intense impact on nature, thereby creating instead of one several - and more complex - problems. Thus, fuel-based industries are being replaced by nuclear-based industries, giving rise to radiation exposure and waste disposal problems. The depletion of the soil through the intensive use of machines is compensated by the use of chemical fertilizers that poison food, water, etc. such a race should someday (most likely rather soon) lead to disaster. But this feeling of hopelessness refers to the options we logically view, and not to the functioning of the supra-individual mind. If the problem can be solved, then only by him. Of course, this problem is common to all mankind, but just as in common mankind science the discovery is made by a specific person, so in the examples known so far, we have seen the work of at least supra-individual, but not universal, but national reason, reflecting, therefore, some special individuality - the individuality of the people (see the above example of England's role in the Industrial Revolution). and not to the functioning of the supra-individual mind. If the problem can be solved, then only by him. Of course, this problem is common to all mankind, but just as in common mankind science the discovery is made by a specific person, so in the examples known so far, we have seen the work of at least supra-individual, but not universal, but national reason, reflecting, therefore, some special individuality - the individuality of the people (see the above example of England's role in the Industrial Revolution).

Returning to the question in the title of the article, we can now say that patriotism is a sense of value, the need for every person's life to include him in the great individuality of the people, or, on the other hand, the instinct of self-preservation of the national individuality. It is a charge of energy, an engine that drives the numerous means by which the unity of the people is maintained: language, national culture, a sense of historical tradition, national features of its religion. Therefore, the extinction of patriotism is the surest sign of the beginning of the end of the people: from a living being, it turns

into a dead machine, disconnected from the energy source that drives it. And the artificial destruction of patriotism is the most reliable way to destroy the people. An example is Russophobia, flashing always at critical moments in Russian history over the last century. We are talking about the destruction of those elements of folk psychology that are functionally equivalent to the myths of "primitive" peoples, with the same result - the extinction of the people. This can be compared with a disease of a popular organism, but not with an ordinary disease, but with a spiritual analogue of AIDS, affecting not just one side of this organism, but its central defense system.

First published in the newspaper "Politics" No. 1, March 1991.